

# Table of Contents

Issue	3
Summary	3
Background	4
Discussion	11
Findings	23
Recommendations	23
Request for Responses	24
Methodology	25
Bibliography	26
List of Appendices	28
Appendix A	29
Appendix B	32
Appendix C	33
Appendix D	34
Appendix E	36
Appendix F	37
Responses	38
City of Belmont	39
City of Brisbane	42
City of Burlingame	44
City of Foster City	46
Untitled	46
City of Menlo Park	49
City of Pacifica	51
City of Redwood City	53
City of San Bruno	55
City of San Carlos	57
City of San Mateo	58
City of South San Francisco	59
Town of Colma	60
Town of Hillsborough	61
Town of Portola Valley	64





# A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know

*Release Date: August 9, 2022*

[Issue](#) | [Summary](#) | [Background](#) | [Discussion](#) | [Findings](#) | [Recommendations](#)  
[Request for Responses](#) | [Methodology](#) | [Bibliography](#) | [Appendices](#) | [Responses](#)

## ISSUE

The California Public Records Act requires that inspection or disclosure of governmental records be available to the public upon request. How do the cities in San Mateo County meet the requirements of this Act?

## SUMMARY

The California Public Records Act (PRA) is an essential tool for the public to find out what their government agencies are doing. It’s one of the freedom of information laws enacted in every state in the Union to ensure that the public can witness the actions of their governments. The PRA’s purpose is to promote government transparency in California.

Fifteen years ago, the 2006-2007 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury’s report, “Electronic Communication Among City Officials: A Valuable Tool in Need of Careful Guidance,” addressed the rise in local governments’ use of electronic forms of communication between elected and appointed officials.<sup>1</sup> As it observed, these valuable and efficient tools can quickly disseminate information, and they can constitute public documents subject to public disclosure. Reviewing that Grand Jury’s report alerted the 2021-2022 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury to the potential that cities may be facing increased complexity and potential burdens in the processing of requests for public records.

The Grand Jury sought to understand how San Mateo County’s 20 cities respond to PRA requests, including:

- Cities’ policies and procedures for handling requests;
- The types of records requests they receive;
- The training of key employees, elected officials, and appointed officials about PRA-related matters; and
- How legal changes may impact cities with regard to fulfilling PRA requests.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2006-2007 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury, Electronic Communication among City Officials: A Valuable Tool in Need of Careful Guidance  
[https://sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand\\_jury/2006/ElectronicCommunicationfinal.pdf](https://sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand_jury/2006/ElectronicCommunicationfinal.pdf), retrieved June 9, 2022.

While the PRA does not require cities to adopt a formal policy, the Grand Jury sought to identify the cities that have written policy or procedure documents and the methods cities use to process the public's requests. It also wanted to learn how key staff keep up to date with changes in PRA law. Failing to comply with these laws can subject a city to litigation and, more importantly, lead to erosion of the public's trust.

The Grand Jury recommends that city councils of the subject cities should:

1. Consider directing staff to create a written PRA procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.
2. Consider directing staff to perform a cost/benefit analysis regarding the purchase of commercially available public records request software.
3. Consider directing staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of their official website.
4. Consider directing staff to create a submittable online PRA request form.
5. Consider directing staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

## **BACKGROUND**

Two centuries ago, James Madison wrote these words:

"A popular Government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a Farce or a Tragedy; or perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance: And a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."<sup>2</sup>

He further asserted, "Knowledge [is] the only Guardian of true liberty."<sup>3</sup>

John Moss, a California member of the U.S. House of Representatives, used Madison's quote to generate support for a bill he was introducing in Congress. In 1967, after a 12-year struggle, he was finally successful in passing the Federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). It served as the model for California's similar Public Records Act enacted one year later.

The California Public Records Act was signed into law by Governor Ronald Reagan in 1968 and acknowledges one simple concept – that secrecy is contrary to a democratic system of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people". Specifically, the PRA declares

---

<sup>2</sup> Letter from James Madison to W.T. Barry (August 4, 1822), in *The Writings of James Madison* (Gaillard Hunt ed.).

<sup>3</sup> Letter from James Madison to George Thomson (June 30, 1825) (on file with *The James Madison Papers* at The Library of Congress).

that “access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state”.<sup>4</sup>

Every state has some form of freedom of information law that governs public access to state and local government documents.<sup>5</sup> In addition, every state has some form of a “Sunshine Law” or “Open Meetings” law that requires public access to meetings of public legislative bodies. California’s Ralph M. Brown Act is such a Sunshine Law.<sup>6</sup> Passed in 1953, it guarantees the public’s right to attend and participate in meetings of local legislative bodies. The PRA and the Brown Act are California’s primary laws intended to promote government transparency.

### **What are Public Records?**

The PRA defines the term “public records” as any “writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business that is prepared, owned, used, or retained by a state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.”<sup>7</sup> Thus, a “writing” is not simply a hand-written or printed document; writings include an ever-broadening range of communications including audio and video recordings, emails, photos, drawings, computer data, and more.<sup>8</sup>

The agencies that hold these public records, and are subject to the PRA, include every county, city, town, school district, special district, police and fire department, commission, and board in California.<sup>9</sup> Certain private entities that carry out public functions using funding from a local agency may also be subject to the PRA. The PRA applies to nearly every public agency one can imagine except for the Legislature and the courts.<sup>10</sup>

A public record refers to information that has been recorded or maintained by a public agency. Typical examples of records that the public might request include:

- Property records,
- Building permits,
- Business registrations
- Employee compensation information
- Financial documents
- Code enforcement records
- Public works documents, and
- Police records.

---

<sup>4</sup> California Government Code, Section 6250 (2021).

<sup>5</sup> FOIA Advocates, State Public Records Laws. <http://www.foiadvocates.com/records.html> Retrieved May 11, 2022

<sup>6</sup> CA Govt Code § 54950 et seq.

<sup>7</sup> CA Govt Code § 6252(e).

<sup>8</sup> CA Govt Code § 6252(g).

<sup>9</sup> CA Govt Code § 6252(f). Excluded from the definition of state agency are those agencies provided for in article IV (except section 20(k)) and article VI of the Cal. Constitution.

<sup>10</sup> The Legislature has its own sunshine law, Gov. Code, § 1070. Most court records are disclosable under a number of legal decisions and the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Merely addressing a question to a local agency official or employee is not sufficient to constitute a public records request under the PRA. “What time do the lights go off at the neighborhood park?” Or “Why are there so many potholes on my street?” are not public records requests. However, a request to see the contract for the vendor who installed the lights or paved the street would be a public records request.

### **The Form of PRA Request**

The PRA ensures that all persons must receive equal access to public records. “Persons” can be corporations, partnerships, homeowners’ associations, and the media.<sup>11</sup> Simply put, every person has the right to inspect public records, and no one type of person has a greater right of access to public records than any other person.<sup>12</sup>

Because the intent of the law is to enable easy access to public records, it is expansive in the available ways requests may be made. The request can be made in writing or orally, by physical or electronic means, remotely or in person. Persons making a PRA request are not required to explain the reason for the request.<sup>13</sup>

Public records are to be open for inspection during office hours at the local agency. To preserve the orderly function of their offices, agencies may establish reasonable policies for the inspection and copying of records. If the request asks for copies of documents, the agency is required to respond within ten days to determine whether they have disclosable records in their possession and to notify the person making the request of that determination. The agency must then make the records “promptly” available.<sup>14</sup>

An agency may extend the normal ten-day requirement for responding whether it has any disclosable documents for up to 14 additional days under certain circumstances.<sup>15</sup> For example, if the agency needs to search through and collect a voluminous number of records or to consult with another agency with an interest in the requested records, such an extension is available.

The agency is required to assist the requester who is having difficulty making a focused and effective PRA request.<sup>16</sup> And while the request may be burdensome, that burden alone is not sufficient to justify noncompliance. However, the agency is also not required to perform a “needle in a haystack” search for records.<sup>17</sup> Additionally, a PRA request only applies to records that exist at the time of the request, not for records to be created in the future.

---

<sup>11</sup> CA Govt Code § 6252(c); *Connell v. Superior Court (Intersource, Inc.)* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 601.

<sup>12</sup> CA Govt Code § 6252.5; *Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 759; *Dixon v. Superior Court* (2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 1271, 1279.

<sup>13</sup> CA Govt Code § 6250; California Constitution, Article I, Section 3.

<sup>14</sup> CA Govt Code § 6253(c).

<sup>15</sup> CA Govt Code § 6253(c)(1-4).

<sup>16</sup> CA Govt Code § 6253.1.

<sup>17</sup> *Cal. First Amend Coalition v. Superior Court* (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 159, 166.

## Widespread Use of Electronic Communications

The public's business increasingly relies on electronic communications. Email, social media postings, video and audio recordings, and the use of personal devices have created enormous volumes of public records for cities. In a case with broad consequences related to PRA requests, *City of San Jose v. Superior Court of Santa Clara County* (2017), the California Supreme Court ruled that communications carried out using a personal account or device were disclosable if the communication was related to the conduct of public business.<sup>18</sup>

For example, such a PRA request might be for all communications between city officials and a vendor that was granted a city-awarded contract. The search for responsive records could include reviewing all the emails, voice mails, and texts between the parties for relevant material, including on officials' personal devices. This can be problematic since this communication, especially if voluminous, could require attorneys to determine what might be non-disclosable for reasons of privacy or privilege. In *Getz v County of El Dorado* (2021), a California appeals court ruled that El Dorado County's unsubstantiated claim that a PRA request was overly broad and burdensome was not a valid reason for denial of records. The court explained that establishing that a request is overly burdensome requires more than the vague prospect of having to review lots of records. The County was ultimately compelled to produce over 40,000 email records.<sup>19</sup>

## Law Enforcement Records

In recent years the most publicized form of an electronic record has been police body-cam footage. Landmark legislation has broadened PRA access to law enforcement records, including a limited subset of these audio and video recordings. On January 1, 2019, SB 1421 became law. Called the Peace Officers: Release of Records bill, it requires law enforcement agencies to make records (including body-cam footage) related to certain serious officer use of force incidents, sexual assault, and acts of dishonesty available under the PRA.<sup>20</sup> Police unions have filed multiple challenges to the law asserting concerns about officers' privacy, retroactivity of the law, and the cost of producing records.<sup>21</sup> These challenges have been consistently denied by courts.<sup>22</sup> And in January 2022, SB 16, became effective. This new law now requires additional police disciplinary records, involving allegations of discrimination, unlawful arrest, and cover-ups of excessive force by fellow officers, to be made available under the PRA.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Latham & Watkins, Client Alert Commentary, <https://www.lw.com/thoughtLeadership/california-supreme-court-government-communications-on-private-accounts-are-public>, retrieved May 11, 2022.

<sup>19</sup> *Getz v. The Superior Court*, 72 Cal.App.5th 637, 287 Cal. Rptr. 3d 722 (Cal. Ct. App. 2021) <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2021/c091337.html>, retrieved June 1, 2022.

<sup>20</sup> CA Penal Code § 832.7 and § 832.8.

<sup>21</sup> Voice of San Diego, A Brief History of Police Challenges. <https://voiceofsandiego.org/2019/06/10/brief-history-of-police-challenges-and-losses-sb-1421/>, retrieved March 18, 2022.

<sup>22</sup> JD Supra, Another SB1421 Decision Against Law Enforcement. <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/another-sb-1421-decision-against-law-45114/>, retrieved March 18, 2022.

<sup>23</sup> BBK Attorneys at Law, SB 16 Compliance Expanded Public Access. <https://www.bbklaw.com/News-Events/Insights/2021/Legal-Alerts/12/SB-16-Compliance-Expanded-Public-Access-to-Law-Enf>, retrieved March 18, 2022.

## **Methods of Handling Requests**

The PRA does not mandate any specific method for agency handling of records requests. Some local agencies simply monitor the process manually using an internally created document. Many other agencies now use commercially available software that links to information on their public websites. Often marketed to city clerks through professional organizations, such as the City Clerks Association of California, these software applications offer solutions to manage large portions of the PRA request process.

These applications can:

- Manage intake of requests through a public portal;
- Provide an automated response of receipt to the person making a request;
- Alert agency staff to deadlines;
- Promote coordination across departments;
- Gather records and track their production to person making a request;
- Provide tools to redact information; and
- Display and store responsive records.

The software enables anyone making a PRA request to see the status of their request through a portal. It also enables cities to make both the request and the records responsive to the request visible to the public.

## **Fees**

An agency may charge a fee for costs of complying with the PRA, but only for the direct costs of making copies of responsive records – typically a nominal fee per page of paper copies. Since today most records are produced and delivered to the requester electronically, many responsive records are cost-free to the requesting party.

In *National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward* (2019), the California Supreme Court held that an effort by the city to charge \$3,000 for labor related to redacting requested bodycam footage was not permissible as a “data extraction” cost.<sup>24</sup> With this decision, the Court reaffirmed that local agencies may not charge for ancillary costs such as the labor required to retrieve documents or the inspection and handling of files.<sup>25</sup>

## **Voter-approved Propositions Affecting the PRA**

In 2004, voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 59, the “Public Records, Open Meetings Legislative Constitutional Amendment.” It essentially adds a “sunshine” amendment to the Declaration of Rights section of the California Constitution (similar to the U.S. Constitution’s

---

<sup>24</sup> Reporters Committee, *National Lawyers Guild v City of Hayward*. <https://www.rcfp.org/briefs-comments/national-lawyers-guild-v-hayward-california-supreme-court>, retrieved June 14, 2022.

<sup>25</sup> BBK Attorneys at Law, *California Public Records Act Update*. <https://www.bbklaw.com/news-events/insights/2021/legal-alerts/01/california-public-records-act-update>, retrieved March 16, 2022.



Bill of Rights) stating, “The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.”<sup>26</sup>

Proposition 42, the “Public Records. Open Meetings. State Reimbursement to Local Agencies. Legislative Constitutional Amendment” was approved by voters in 2014. It was the result of a dispute over a controversial bill that would stop local governments from being required to follow key provisions of the PRA. The State legislature had considered the bill to be a budget move, since at that time it was required to reimburse local governments for complying with some aspects of records requests. The backlash over the signing of this bill caused the legislature to rescind it and put the matter before the voters as a constitutional amendment. When it passed, by a 62% yes vote, it required local governments to comply with the PRA without being reimbursed by the State for the cost of public access to records.”<sup>27</sup> The full financial burden of compliance with the PRA now falls entirely on local governments.

## **Exemptions**

While the PRA states that “the people” have the right to know what their government is doing, clearly circumstances arise where a balance must be achieved between the public interest and individual privacy rights. The PRA contains at least 76 express exemptions, for matters as diverse as library circulation records, copyright protected building plans, and medical and personnel records.<sup>28</sup> In some instances a public document may not be considered exempt but may contain private information such as social security numbers and home addresses. Those specific portions will be redacted before release to the public.

Government Code section 6254 specifies a large number of exemptions under the PRA. Several of the more notable exemptions are listed below:

- **Records Not in Existence**

The agency is under no obligation to create records where none exist; agencies are not required to provide records that may be produced in the future relevant to the original request.

- **Disclosure of records exempted by Federal or other State law**

Records shielded from disclosure by existing state or federal law, such as individual health records, are not accessible using the PRA.

- **Public Interest Test and Deliberative Process Privilege**

Agencies may withhold certain records if they can demonstrate that the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by its disclosure.

---

<sup>26</sup> Cal. Const., Art I, § 3, subd. (b)(1)

<sup>27</sup> Cal. Const., Art. I, § 3, subd. (b)(7)

<sup>28</sup> CA Govt Code § 6254

- **Preliminary Drafts**

Preliminary drafts, notes, or memos not normally preserved in the course of business are exempt.

- **Attorney Client Communications**

Confidential communications between lawyers and clients, and attorney work product, are exempt from disclosure.

- **Pending Litigation**

Records pertaining to pending litigation or claims to which a public agency is a party until the litigation or claim has been finally adjudicated or otherwise settled.

- **Personal Information**

This exemption is intended to protect the confidentiality of personnel, medical or other similar files which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

- **Trade Secrets**

Businesses engaged in public contracts are not required to disclose their trade secrets in response to a PRA request.

## **Recourse When Responsive Documents Are Not Produced**

If a local agency has unlawfully refused to disclose a public record, a person may ask a judge to enforce their rights under the PRA. This enforcement is primarily through a special, expedited civil judicial process.<sup>29</sup> The PRA provides specific relief in the form of court costs and attorneys' fees when an agency unlawfully denies access or copies of public records.

Conversely, a local agency cannot bring an action for relief to determine its obligation to disclose records.<sup>30</sup> That would require the person requesting documents to defend a civil action and discourage them from requesting records in the first place. It would frustrate the central purpose of the act and the constitutional amendments specifically designed to provide access to information.

The PRA is an indispensable tool for the responsible exercise of democracy in California. Government transparency, accountability and effectiveness depend on how our local agencies handle the information they create and are entrusted with maintaining. A changing legal framework, the ubiquity of electronic records, new communications technologies and the treatment of their related records, and the public's demonstrated desire for "open government" present significant challenges to the efficient handling of PRA requests for the cities in our county.

---

<sup>29</sup> CA Govt Code § 6258 and 6259.


<sup>30</sup> *Filarsky v. Superior Court* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 419, 426.

## DISCUSSION

As stated above, the PRA applies to all of the public agencies in San Mateo County. To narrow the focus of our investigation, the Grand Jury opted to concentrate on the 20 cities, including their police and other departments, and the committees and commissions formed by those cities.

### Survey Respondents

The Grand Jury began by sending a survey to the 20 city managers in the County (a copy of the survey appears in Appendix A). It asked six questions related to the processing of public records requests, policies and procedures used, and the PRA training of staff and officials. In most cases (13 of 20) the responses came from city clerks who are responsible for maintaining a city's public records. Some of the clerks perform multiple roles for their cities, reflected in some cases (15%) by an additional job title. The following graphic illustrates the various job titles of survey respondents.



In two cities, the city clerk position is determined by public election; in the remainder of the cities, clerks are appointed by the city manager. Our investigation found that the city clerk is typically the official primarily responsible for the acknowledging receipt of a PRA request, tracking it through the city's internal processes, and delivering correspondence and responsive records to the person submitting the request.<sup>31</sup>

The Grand Jury conducted follow-up interviews with representatives of all 20 cities, confirming their survey responses and gathering additional information. We asked the cities to provide written documentation of their PRA policies and procedures, if any exist. Fourteen cities replied that they had existing policies or procedures and supplied them to the Grand Jury. We also conducted in-depth interviews with five selected cities.<sup>32</sup> These cities were chosen to give us a cross section sample based on city population, method of tracking, and volume of requests. The

<sup>31</sup> In one city, the city attorney assumed most of this role, but even there the city clerk was involved in the process.

<sup>32</sup> Belmont, Daly City, San Bruno, San Mateo, and South San Francisco

Grand Jury notes that respondents from all 20 cities were entirely cooperative and knowledgeable about their city’s PRA request procedures.

### Documentation of PRA Policies and Procedures

The PRA does not require local agencies to create policies or documentation of how they receive, route, track, and fulfill records requests. When the Grand Jury asked respondents and interviewees to provide documentation describing how they handled PRA requests, we learned that six cities had no such documentation.<sup>33</sup> In some cases, the documentation received from the remaining 14 cities was simply a description of the PRA’s requirements (perhaps supplied to staff for training for information). The Grand Jury also received documents such as the city’s internal procedures, as well as some that were formal policies signed and dated by the city manager. In interviews, all respondents could describe their processes.

The documentation received and reviewed by the Grand Jury varied widely. Atherton’s document is a colorful presentation defining the PRA and describing what is and isn’t a public record.

## Public Records Requests

*Town of Atherton Records Coordinators*

*What is the California Public Records Act?*

The Public Records Act assures the public’s right to access information concerning *the People’s Business*. Adopted in 1968, the CPRA’s legislative findings declare that access to information about the conduct of the public’s business is a *fundamental and necessary right* of every person in the state. The findings also assert that the Legislature is mindful of the right of individual’s privacy, and for the past 40+ years, courts have balanced those competing interests within the CPRA.

---

<sup>33</sup> Grand Jury survey (December 2021) Belmont, Daly City, Half Moon Bay, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, and Woodside.

It generally outlines city staff's role in responding to a request. In contrast, Redwood City's document is an administrative policy detailing the purpose and scope of how they respond to PRA requests. It notes specific types of records such as political reform act records and requests for electronic communications. It also specifies that the document will be reviewed every two years. Copies of the PRA documentation provided by Atherton and Redwood City can be found in Appendix B.

The Grand Jury noted that some cities relied on an individual staff member (city clerk or city attorney) to respond to records requests. In the event of illness, vacation, resignation or other interruption of service, no documentation exists to guide replacement personnel.

Written PRA policies or procedures provided to the Grand Jury typically covered subjects such as:

- The purpose of the PRA;
- Resources for PRA training;
- The steps in processing a request; and
- Specific staff responsibilities.

### **Website Portals**

The Grand Jury found that while cities do receive PRA requests in various ways - submitted in-person at city offices, by telephone, and postal mail - they are most frequently submitted via email. We found that 16 of the 20 city websites included a portal containing a submittable form for the filing of a PRA request and four cities had no such form.<sup>34</sup>


Every city website somewhere provides instructions on how to make a PRA request. Some have links to those instructions on the home page, but most require steps to navigate to it. In some cases, the Grand Jury found broken links indicating inconsistencies in the level of maintenance of the PRA related pages. Some city websites simply instruct the public to send a public records request to the city clerk and provide contact information including an email address, a phone number, or a physical address at which to file.

---

<sup>34</sup> Belmont, Brisbane, Hillsborough, and Portola Valley.

## Example of Easy and Accessible PRA-Information on a City Website

The website for the City of South San Francisco provides easily accessible information regarding PRA requests. The home page includes a “Public Records Request” link.



Clicking on the link brings up a page full of useful titles including how to make a request, the city’s PRA policy, who can make a request, and tips to expedite requests.



Clicking on “Public Records Request” takes the user to a third-party public records web application where they can search by request reference number, track the status of a previous request, view a public archive, and submit a new request.

The screenshot displays the 'Public Records Center' website for the City of South San Francisco, California. The header features the city name in white text on a dark blue background. Below the header, the page is organized into a left-hand navigation menu and a main content area with four large, light-colored buttons.

**Public Records Center**

**Public Records Menu**

- Home
- FAQs
- Submit a Request
- My Request Center

**FAQs**

See All FAQs

- How much does it cost to process my request?
- How long does it take to process my request?
- How can I review responsive records?
- How detailed should I be when explaining what I'm looking for?

**Search by Reference Number**  
Search with a specific reference number to find your request.


**Submit a Request**  
Submit a Public Records Request to the City.

**Visit My Records Center**  
Track the status of requests, manage account information, and download your records by logging into your account.

**View Public Archive**  
View previously released public record requests

## Tracking a Public Records Request

Since the PRA mandates specific deadlines for public agencies to respond to a public records request, the ability to track submissions is vital in order to ensure legal compliance.<sup>35</sup> All cities informed the Grand Jury that they track PRA requests, utilizing a variety of methods to do so. Regardless of the specific method used by a city, the workflow is generally as follows.



Ten cities, which were generally smaller and field fewer requests, reported that they track PRA requests manually using an Excel spreadsheet or similar internal document.<sup>36</sup> These documents

<sup>35</sup> CA Govt Code § 6253(c).

<sup>36</sup> Atherton, Brisbane, Burlingame, Colma, Daly City, East Palo Alto, Hillsborough, Portola Valley, San Bruno, and Woodside as of May 16, 2022.



require manual data entry and maintenance by staff. For example, see San Bruno’s spreadsheet at Appendix C. While these cities indicated general satisfaction with their current methods of tracking, one city was actively seeking proposals from commercial software vendors and others were considering doing so. Appendix D shows such a vendor’s proposal.

The ten other cities, including most of the larger ones, use third-party software that automates the handling of PRA requests.<sup>37</sup> These cities use one of two software applications.<sup>38</sup> In interviews, staff generally expressed satisfaction with both products, citing their effectiveness and efficiency. Pricing of these applications will vary based on the configuration and storage options selected. One city indicated a desire to purchase software but cited the city’s budget constraints. Another city noted that the cost was prohibitive for a city of their size and volume of requests.

### **Volume of Requests**

Thirteen cities reported receiving more than 100 PRA requests in the past year. Two cities reported receiving fewer than 50 requests, while one city indicated that it received more than 1,600 requests for records. Another city noted a 500% increase from the previous year. All cities reported significant increases in the volume of requests received since the outset of the Covid pandemic.

### **Subjects of Requested Records**

All 20 cities reported that the majority of the PRA requests they received were for routine records such as property-related documents, police records, public works documents, and business registrations. For example, in San Mateo, the City Clerk’s office recorded 1,695 PRA requests in the fiscal year ended June 30, 2021. The largest percentage (46%) were directed to the Community Development Department and typically asked for property records of some kind, including planning applications, building permits, blueprints, inspections, and code violations. Requests for police records (35%) were the next most frequently requested type of record. The clerk’s office noted that the police department directly receives substantially more requests than come to the clerk through their PRA request software.

### **Time-Consuming Requests**

The Grand Jury learned that a relatively small number of records requests are disproportionately time-consuming to fulfill. In particular, requests for communications records may fall into this category. The request may require a broad search of all relevant communications created and stored on electronic devices, including employees’ cell phones and laptops. Recently, Portola Valley received what was characterized as a “massive” PRA request for “all town communications regarding the housing element since July 1, 2021, including communications among elected officials, staff, consultants or members of the committee, like emails and text

---

<sup>37</sup> Foster City, Half Moon Bay, Menlo Park, Millbrae, Pacifica, Redwood City, San Carlos, San Mateo, and South San Francisco as of May 16, 2022.

<sup>38</sup> GovQA, If You Have a Public Records Problem. <https://www.govqa.com/solutions/public-records-software/> Retrieved May 16, 2022, and NextRequest, The All-In-One Open Records Request Platform. <https://www.nextrequest.com/>, retrieved May 16, 2022.

messages, including on personal devices.”<sup>39</sup> The request was the result of a potential change to the town’s zoning laws to allow for more dense housing in one residential neighborhood.

Several cities reported to the Grand Jury that on rare occasions a disgruntled citizen or ex-employee has intentionally crafted a detailed records request intending to be time-consuming and annoying for the city. One respondent reported that the search and review of electronics communications in response to one request took months to complete, due to the number of responsive records and the broad search of multiple devices.

## Training

State law does not mandate training for those implementing its provisions. City clerks often attend training through annual City Clerks Association of California conferences and other professional associations.

Public Records Act Overview  
(including Police Records)  
City Clerks New Law and Elections Seminar  
December 17, 2020

Best Best & Krieger  
Company/BestBestKrieger  
@BBKlaw

BBK BEST BEST & KRIEGER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

© 2020 Best Best & Krieger LLP

Half of the cities interviewed by the Grand Jury mandate formal PRA training for their key employees. Others offer training but do not mandate it, while some cities have no formal arrangements for PRA training at all.<sup>40</sup> Training, if offered, is conducted by the city attorney. In

<sup>39</sup> Angela Swartz, “‘Massive’ public records request escalates battle over Portola Valley’s housing element,” *Almanac*, March 21, 2022.

<https://www.almanacnews.com/news/2022/03/21/massive-public-records-request-escalates-battle-over-portola-valleys-housing-element>, retrieved June 9, 2022.

<sup>40</sup> Burlingame, Portola Valley, and Woodside.

our investigation, respondents agreed that formal training for key city employees would make the handling of records requests more efficient and consistent.

Twelve cities informed the Grand Jury that they provide PRA training for their appointed and elected officials. This training is also typically provided by the city attorney, sometimes with the assistance of the city clerk. Eight cities reported that they do not offer specific PRA training to such officials, but some noted that their training in Brown Act compliance includes PRA training content.<sup>41</sup>

While the PRA does not include criminal penalties for noncompliance with its provisions, civil actions, as described earlier, may be filed and cities can be liable for court costs and attorneys' fees.

### **Increasing Efficiency in Records Request Processing**

Some cities have demonstrated how commonly requested records can be made available to the public without formal PRA requests.

Making public records available online is a convenient and efficient mechanism for both the requester and the municipality. Cities generally do this for many common records, such as meeting agendas for public meetings (which are legally required to be posted publicly).<sup>42</sup> At the time of this investigation, some cities, such as San Carlos, also posted many records online. Using the search term “public records” on the San Carlos city website brings up “Records

---

<sup>41</sup>BBK, Attorneys at Law, Summary of the Major Provisions and Requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act. <https://www.bbklaw.com/bbk/media/library/pdf/major-provisions-and-requirements-of-the-brown-act.pdf>, retrieved June 9, 2022.

<sup>42</sup> CA Govt Code § 54954.2.

Available Online for Your Easy Access,” which connects to records such as budgets, building permits, and public works documents.

## Submit a Public Records Request

If you are unable to locate the records you want online, please submit a Public Records Request via our NextRequest portal:



Our goal is to provide you with timely access to the City's public records. All requests for documents will be reviewed and responded to within ten (10) days, in compliance with the California Public Records Act. Fees are charged according to our fee schedule, however, there is no charge to review records in person at City Hall.

- [Master fee schedule](#)

## Records Available Online for Your Easy Access

- [Accounts payable cash disbursements journal](#)
- [Active business registrations](#)
- [Budgets](#)
- [Building Permits](#)
- [City Council and Commission agendas, minutes and videos](#)
- [City Municipal Code](#)
- [Citywide Reports](#)
- [Financial Reports and Documents](#)
- [Ordinances and Resolutions](#)
- [Various Public Works Documents, including documents pertaining to sewers, streets, traffic, etc.](#)

The Half Moon Bay website offered a “Document Center” containing more than 2,000 city documents going back a decade.

Showing all descriptions

- ADA / 504 Grievance Forms
- BID/RFP Center
- City Clerk
  - Cannabis Ballot Measures
    - Manufacturing**
      - Mature Cultivation
      - Rebuttals
      - Retail
      - Starts
      - Tax
    - City Council Committee Agend
    - City Council Photos 2020
    - Commissions/Committee Form
    - Council Actions
    - districting
      - Future Leaders
      - Smoking Ordinances
    - City Manager
    - City Projects
      - Communications
    - Community Development
      - COVID Testing
      - Emergency Preparedness
      - Engineering
    - Finance
      - Homeless
    - Human Resources
      - Newsletters
      - Parklet Program
    - Public Works
    - Recreation
    - Sheriffs
    - Sidewalk R&R

Display Name	Size (KB)
IA_ManufacturingAdvisory	120
Manufacturing_WEB-argument against mfg	100
Manufacturing_WEB-argument for mfg	135
Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure MM_mfg.WEB	148
Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure MM_mfg.WEB	148

Displaying items 1 - 5 of 5

Several cities noted that they often receive requests for the same records repeatedly. For example, this can occur when a sought-after property is offered for sale and brokers, architects, attorneys, and potential buyers are doing their due diligence. Cities using commercially provided software applications, or that post public records as do San Carlos and Half Moon Bay, can reduce the number of such duplicative PRA requests.

## Records Management

Proper records management policies and practices facilitate effective compliance with the PRA. Having better control of these records makes their timely and appropriate production more accurate and efficient. All cities in the County reported having records retention schedules that determine what documents must be retained and for how long. For example, in South San Francisco, leases for city owned properties must be kept in hard copy for the current year plus two-years. Board and commission resolutions must be kept permanently (a copy of the records retention schedule for South San Francisco is at Appendix E).

The City of San Mateo reported a unique method for encouraging city staff in one element of the effective management of public records. There, the city clerk held a “Records Clean Up Day” (related materials are contained in Appendix F). During this event employees are tasked with:

- Reducing the number of duplicate records;
- Preparing records for off-site storage;
- Imaging and indexing electronic records; and
- Identifying electronic records eligible for destruction.

The retention life cycle of various records determined how different categories of documents are handled. The program was designed to create an enjoyable environment around these tedious tasks by employing a food truck, encouraging casual dress, creating contests with prizes, and printing T-shirts commemorating the day. The program included an on-site shred truck, and the city attorney was available for consultation.



In an email to the Grand Jury, a city staffer wrote, “In addition to elevating the employee understanding that these public records are an asset of the city (just like the vac truck, fleet, and streets) ...we have a duty to manage and maintain them well; reinforce the policy and procedures we have adopted; and let’s face it, maintaining records can become back burner in the flurry of day-to-day needs and requests. Setting aside time to honor the need, accomplish an objective and then celebrate it – keeps it more in the forefront of the mind and honors the importance of the public’s records.”<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Grand Jury correspondence April 26, 2022.

## **Law Enforcement Records**

Some cities reported receiving significant numbers of requests for police records. All such requests were forwarded directly to city police departments or the County Sheriff's Office (for those cities contracting for police services).<sup>44</sup> Law enforcement agencies typically employ a records manager tasked with responding to public records requests. In some cities the disposition of these requests was reported back to the city clerk for inclusion in their tracking systems; in others, the city clerk had no knowledge of the status of a police records request. The Grand Jury did not investigate how these requests for law enforcement records were handled in compliance with the PRA. It is of note that most law enforcement records are exempted from the Public Records Act pursuant to Government Code Section 6254(f).

## **FINDINGS**

- F1. The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.
- F2. The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.
- F3. Information about how to access public records requires multiple clicks to find on the city's website, which hinders the public's access to public records.
- F4. The City of San Mateo implements a Records Cleanup Day with the purpose of increasing employee understanding of the need to effectively maintain public records, thereby improving PRA request responsiveness.
- F5. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- R1. The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.
- R2. The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.
- R3. By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.
- R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."
- R5. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to create, on the city clerk's page of its website, a submittable PRA request form.

---

<sup>44</sup> Contracting cities are Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, San Carlos, Woodside, and Portola Valley.

## REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses from the selected city and town councils as follows (x):

City	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
<b>Atherton</b>			X		X		X	X	X	
<b>Belmont</b>	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Brisbane</b>			X		X		X	X	X	X
<b>Burlingame</b>							X		X	
<b>Colma</b>							X		X	
<b>Daly City</b>	X	X				X			X	
<b>East Palo Alto</b>							X		X	
<b>Foster City</b>		X							X	
<b>Half Moon Bay</b>	X	X				X		X	X	
<b>Hillsborough</b>	X		X		X	X	X		X	X
<b>Menlo Park</b>	X	X				X		X	X	
<b>Millbrae</b>		X							X	
<b>Pacifica</b>		X							X	
<b>Portola Valley</b>			X		X		X	X	X	X
<b>Redwood City</b>		X						X	X	
<b>San Bruno</b>			X		X		X	X	X	
<b>San Carlos</b>		X							X	
<b>San Mateo</b>		X		X						
<b>South San Francisco</b>		X							X	
<b>Woodside</b>	X				X	X	X		X	

The governing bodies indicated above should be aware that the comment or response of the governing body must be conducted subject to the notice, agenda, and open meeting requirements of the Brown Act.



## RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

California Penal Code Section 933.05, provides (emphasis added):

(a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following:

(1) The respondent **agrees** with the finding.

(2) The respondent **disagrees** wholly or partially with the finding; in which case the response shall **specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.**

(b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

(1) The recommendation has been implemented, **with a summary regarding the implemented action.**

(2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, **with a timeframe for implementation.**

(3) The recommendation requires further analysis, **with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.**

(4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, **with an explanation therefor.**

## METHODOLOGY

Through examination of surveys, interviews, the documentation provided by the cities, a demonstration of third-party software, and a site visit, the Grand Jury studied how cities respond to public records requests, and how they keep up with changes in the law.

### Survey

- The Grand Jury developed an online survey consisting of six questions and a request for copies of their PRA policies and procedures.
- The survey was sent to all 20 city managers in the County and various respondents completed the survey.
- We then followed up with a brief phone interview to confirm the responses received from those completing the survey, and to request written policy and procedures documents and records retention policies.

## **Documents**

The Grand Jury reviewed:

- Policy and procedure documents from all cities that indicated having them.
- Records retention policies from several cities.
- Proposals and contracts for third-party software received from various vendors
- Marketing material of third-party software vendors
- Research on best practices in records management

## **Site Tour**

- GJ conducted a site visit to the San Bruno City Attorney's office.
- San Mateo conducted a virtual demonstration of their third-party software.

## **Interviews**

- The Grand Jury conducted further interviews with city attorneys, city clerks and city managers based on those with written policies or procedures documents, training of key employees and elected and appointed officials (advisory bodies), number of public records requests received per year, and those with an elected city clerk.

## **Web Sites**

- The official websites of the 20 cities in the County were reviewed to assess the ease in locating information relating to public records, the methods of submission of a public records request, as well as users' direct access to commonly requested public records.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- League of California Cities (Revised April 2017). The People's Business: A Guide to the California Records Act. Sacramento, CA.
- League of California Cities. "Open and Public V: A Guide to the Ralph M. Brown Act." Accessed May 24, 2022. [https://www.calcities.org/docs/default-source/city-attorneys/open-public-v-revised-2016.pdf?sfvrsn=995414c9\\_3](https://www.calcities.org/docs/default-source/city-attorneys/open-public-v-revised-2016.pdf?sfvrsn=995414c9_3).
- Best Best & Krieger. "The Engineering of Public Records Processing." December 2021 Accessed May 24, 2022. <https://www.calcities.org/docs/default-source/city-clerks-new-law-and-elections-seminar---session-materials/the-engineering-of-public-records-processing.pdf>.
- Californians Aware (2004). Top 10 Points to Remember about Exemptions from the California Public Records Act. Carmichael, CA.
- GovQA. "Best Practices for Fulfilling Public Records Requests." Accessed May 11, 2022. [www.GovQA.com-best-practices-fulfilling-public-records-requests](http://www.GovQA.com-best-practices-fulfilling-public-records-requests).

- NextRequest. “Current Issues Affecting Public Records Request Management.” <https://www.nextrequest.com/blog/current-issues-affecting-public-records-request-management>, accessed May 11, 2022.
- Stephan A. Barber. “The California Public Records Act: The Public’s Right of Access to governmental Information.” 7 Pac.L.J. (1976). Accessed May 24, 2022. <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2423&context=mlr>
- California Government Code – GOV Title 1, Division 7, Chapter 3.5, Sections 6250 - 6276.50 Inspection of Public Records.
- Ballotpedia. “Transparency Checklist”. [https://ballotpedia.org/Transparency\\_checklist](https://ballotpedia.org/Transparency_checklist). Accessed June 7, 2022

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A – The Grand Jury Survey Results

Appendix B – PRA Policies and Procedures: Atherton and Redwood City

Appendix C – San Bruno PRA Request Log

Appendix D – GovQA Proposal for Services


Appendix E – South San Francisco Retention Schedule

Appendix F – City of San Mateo’s Clean-Up Day Staff Plan and Flyer

## APPENDIX A The Grand Jury Survey Results


What is your job title?

20 responses




2. Have you established internal written procedures, or policies, for handling Public Records Act requests? If YES, please provide documentation to: [rweiss@smcivilgrandjury.org](mailto:rweiss@smcivilgrandjury.org).

20 responses




3. Please indicate if you use any of the following to track the status of each Public Records Act request.




4. How many requests do you receive per year?

20 responses




5. Does your city mandate formal Public Records Act training for key employees?

20 responses




6. Does your city offer Public Records Act training for elected and appointed officials (i.e. advisory boards, commissions, committees)?



7. Have you adopted a written document retention policy?

20 responses



## APPENDIX B

### PRA Policies and Procedures: Atherton and Redwood City

**Atherton:** [https://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand\\_jury/2021/Appendix B - PRA PAP Atherton.pdf](https://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand_jury/2021/Appendix B - PRA PAP Atherton.pdf)

**Redwood City:** [https://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand\\_jury/2021/Appendix B - PRA PAP Redwood City.pdf](https://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand_jury/2021/Appendix B - PRA PAP Redwood City.pdf)



**APPENDIX C**  
**San Bruno PRA Request Log**  
(sample page with requester names removed)

#	PRA	Sbpna	Date of request	Date Received	Requester Name	Description of Records	Dept(s)	Response Due Date	Acknowledgment Letter Out	Records Provided
1	X		07/01/21	07/01/21		June 2021 Building permits	CD	07/12/21	Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 07/08/21	07/08/21
2	X		07/01/21	07/01/21		Docs re CPUC approval of purchase of streetlights from	PW	07/12/21	Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 07/08/21	7/8/2021
3	X		07/07/21	07/07/21		Records involving code enforcement, utility shut offs, and fire damaged properties	CD/CE/FD/ Finance	07/19/21 08/18/21	req <a href="#">30 day ext</a> - now due 08/18/21. Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 08/18/21	08/18/21
4	X		07/08/21	07/08/21		June 2021 Business licenses	Finance	07/19/21	Emailed report on 07/19/21	07/19/21
5	X		07/13/21	7/13/2021		June 2021 Building permits	CD	07/23/21	Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 07/13/21	7/13/2021
6	X		07/13/21	07/13/21		Records involving code enforcement, utility shut offs, and fire damaged properties	CD/CE/FD/ Finance	7/23/2021 08/23/21	07/23/21 req <a href="#">30 day ext</a> - now due 08/23/21. Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 08/18/21.	08/18/21
7		X				Subpoena for records involving 692 Green Ave	CE/CD/ PW	07/19/21	Emailed <a href="#">rcds</a> on 07/23/21	07/23/21
8	X		07/14/21	07/15/21		Oldest current standing houses in SB	CD??	07/26/21	Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 07/23/21	X
9	X		07/15/21	07/15/21		Private tows from 04/01/21 thru 06/30/21	PD	07/26/21	Emailed report on 07/26/21	07/26/21
10	X		07/17/21	07/19/21		Electronic copy of all payment transactions for fiscal year 2020	Finance	07/29/21	Emailed link to agenda packets on 07/29/21	7/29/2021
11	X		07/20/21	07/20/21		2020 Pension Benefit/Payout Report	Finance	07/30/21	Request was meant for City of Concord - withdrawn on 07/31/21	Withdrawn
12	X		07/19/21	07/20/21		Uncashed checks	Finance	07/30/21	Emailed link to website on 07/29/21	7/29/2021
13	X		07/22/21	07/22/21		Building & FD <a href="#">rcds</a> for 787 E SB Ave	CD/FD	08/02/21	Emailed <a href="#">rcds</a> on 08/02/21	8/2/2021
14	X		07/09/21	07/09/21		Firearm & Ammunition arrests & <a href="#">related</a> demographic	PD	7/19/2021 08/18/21	req <a href="#">30 day ext</a> - now due 08/18/21. Emailed <a href="#">rmps</a> on 08/18/21	8/18/2021

## APPENDIX D GovQA Proposal for Services



Order Form

### PRICING SUMMARY

The pricing and terms within this Proposal are specific to the products and volumes contained within this Proposal.

<b>One-Time Fees</b>			
<b>Solution</b>	<b>Billing Frequency</b>	<b>Quantity/Unit</b>	<b>One-Time Fee</b>
FOIA Platform Onboarding	Up Front	1 Each	\$0.00
Online Training – Administrator	Up Front	1 Each	\$0.00
Online Training – Users	Up Front	1 Each	\$0.00
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>New Subscription Fees</b>			
<b>Solution</b>	<b>Billing Frequency</b>	<b>Quantity/Unit</b>	<b>Annual Fee</b>
Essentials Package 3	Annual	1 Each	\$10,500.00
PST Email Extractor	Annual	1 Each	\$1,500.00
Payments Module	Annual	1 Each	\$0.00
Hosted Data Storage (TB)	Annual	1 Each	\$0.00
Invoicing Module	Annual	1 Each	\$0.00
FOIA Module for Enterprise Sales	Annual	1 Each	\$0.00
Redaction License (per named user)	Annual	3 Each	\$0.00
ADFS/Single Sign-on Module	Annual	1 Each	\$0.00
Advanced Email Tracking	Annual	1 Each	\$0.00
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			<b>\$12,000.00</b>

 GRANICUS  
**FUTURE YEAR PRICING**

Solution(s)	Period of Performance	
	Year 2	Year 3
Essentials Package 3	\$11,235.00	\$12,021.45
PST Email Extractor	\$1,605.00	\$1,717.35
Payments Module	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hosted Data Storage (TB)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Invoicing Module	\$0.00	\$0.00
FOIA Module for Enterprise Sales	\$0.00	\$0.00
Redaction License (per named user)	\$0.00	\$0.00
ADFS/Single Sign-on Module	\$0.00	\$0.00
Advanced Email Tracking	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>	<b>\$12,840.00</b>	<b>\$13,738.80</b>

**APPENDIX E**  
**South San Francisco Records Retention Schedule 2016**

[https://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand\\_jury/2021/Appendix E - SSF Retention Schedule 2016.pdf](https://www.sanmateocourt.org/documents/grand_jury/2021/Appendix_E_-_SSF_Retention_Schedule_2016.pdf)

**APPENDIX F**  
**City of San Mateo's Clean-Up Day Staff Plan and Flyer**

San Mateo Records Clean-Up Day Staff Plan

Department/Location/Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Clean-Up: May 05, 2022 Cinco De Mayo

This Form Due To Your Dept. Record Coordinator 4/28/22

**Goal(s) for clean-up day** (select all that apply)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare paper records for destruction | <input type="checkbox"/> Email clean-up (delete unnecessary emails. Move attachments that are records to the correct records repository e.g., One Drive, SharePoint, Laserfiche ) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dispose of duplicate records          | <input type="checkbox"/> Identify electronic records that are eligible for destruction  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare records for off-site storage  | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus on imaging, indexing electronic records  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sort through off-site storage records | <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure website content is accurate and up-to-date (Remove old/outdated documents and/ or pages from website)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> File paper files                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Develop file inventory                |   |

**Key Activities and Strategies:** What will you do to accomplish these goals? Be as specific as possible.

# Welcome Back San Mateo

## ANNUAL CINCO DE MAYO

### RECORDS CLEAN-UP DAY PICNIC

*Let's Celebrate being together in person again  
with a picnic of specialty tacos in our backyard with your colleagues!*

**How to join the fun (and yes, records clean-up is fun!)**

1. Ask your Department's Records Coordinator for a records clean-up commitment form.
2. Choose from a list of clean-up activities or create your own
3. Sign the form and provide it to your Records Coordinator by **April 28, 2022** - this is your RSVP for the luncheon. Sorry: No form - no tacos.
4. On or before 5/5/22 clean-up, purge, & organize those records!

**Questions?** Talk to your Records Coordinator  
or Alesha Boyd in the City Clerk's Office

**Join us here!**



**Join us for Tacos in City Hall Backyard  
11:00 am - 12:30 pm**

*Courtesy of the Clerks for anyone who committed to  
Records Clean-up*

- Salad
- Tacos - Grilled Chicken, Steak, Carnitas
- Veggie Spanish Rice and Veggie Beans
- Grilled Veggies
- Guacamole, sour cream and cheese fixins
- Corn tortillas
- Chips and Salsa
- Churros for dessert! Yum!



October 28, 2022

Hon. Amara A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

**RE: Response To Grand Jury Report: “A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public Right to Know”**

Honorable Judge Lee,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report filed on August 9, 2022. The report instructed the City of Belmont to respond to findings F1, F3, and F5 and to five recommendations, R1 through R5. Pursuant to Penal Code §933.05, the following response to the Grand Jury was reviewed and approved by the City Council at its meeting on October 25, 2022. The City of Belmont’s response to both the findings and recommendations are listed below.

**Response to Grand Jury Findings (The City is instructed to respond to Findings 1, 3 and 5):**

F1. The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.

**Response: The City partially disagrees with this finding.**

The City has a PRA response tracking process, however as referenced in the report upon implementation of City’s commercially available public records request web portal an updated written internal policy and procedures for handling PRA requests will be completed.

F3. Information about how to access public records requires multiple clicks to find on the city’s website, which hinders the public ‘s access to public records.

**Response: The City agrees with this finding.**

The City is in process of procuring a commercially available public records request web portal, to automate and centralize the submittal, records retrieval, internal processing, and response to all public records requests, and as a result will redesign access to the site through more direct website interface.

F5. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.

**Response:** the City agrees with this finding.

The City is in process of procuring a commercially available public records request web portal to automate and centralize the submittal, records retrieval, internal processing, and response to all public records requests in a more efficient manner.

**Response to Grand Jury Recommendations (The City is instructed to respond to all recommendations):**

R1. The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.

**Response:** This recommendation is in process and will be implemented by June 30, 2023.

The City Clerk's Office is in the process of updating written procedures along with the deployment of a new PRA web portal by the recommended date.

R2. The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.

**Response:** This recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented by June 30, 2023.

The City is in process of procuring a commercially available public records request web portal, by April 2023, to automate and centralize the submittal, records retrieval, internal processing, and response to all public records requests in a more efficient manner.

R3. By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.

**Response:** This recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented by June 30, 2023.

Once the City's web portal is fully integrated, staff will create a direct link for ease of accessing the public PRA portal.



R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**Response:** The recommendation requires further analysis.

The City of Belmont currently does not have available resources to implement the City of San Mateo's records management practices. The City will evaluate best practices as it relates to the City of Belmont's processes and practices by April 2023.


R5. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to create, on the city clerk's page of its website, a submittable PRA request form.

**Response:** This recommendation will be implemented by June 30, 2023.

Once the City's PRA web portal is fully integrated, staff will create a direct link for ease of accessing the public PRA portal linked to the City Clerk's page.

The City of Belmont appreciates the Grand Jury's effort in this regard and we continue to strive for excellence in government operations by improving the public's access to records while increasing efficiency in records management and transparency.

Respectfully,



Jozi Plut, CMC, CPMC  
City Clerk/Communications Coordinator



## City of Brisbane

50 Park Place

Brisbane, CA 94005-1310

(415) 508-2100

October 21, 2022

Honorable Amara A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Re: Grand Jury Report - "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Honorable Judge Lee,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report issued on August 9, 2022. Please find the City of Brisbane's response to both the findings and recommendations below. This response to the Grand Jury was approved by the City of Brisbane's City Council at a public meeting on October 20, 2022.

### **FINDINGS:**

**F3. Information about how to access public records requires multiple clicks to find on the city's website, which hinders the public's access to public records.**

Response: The respondent agrees with the finding. This information is currently located within one click from the City Clerk's page but not the homepage. Subsequent to receiving the August 9, 2022 Grand Jury Report, the City Clerk and Communications Staff have worked on providing more information about how to access public records on the City's website, which work should be completed by November 1, 2022.

Public access to public records will be accessible via multiple channels through the website:

- Via the City Clerk webpage under the sub-heading "Public Records Request"
- Via the "Online Services..." icon listed on the home page under the sub-heading "Public Records Request"
- Via the Government Tab on the homepage under the sub-heading "Public Records Request"

**F5. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.**

Response: Respondent agrees with the finding. A general contact form was available to the public to make public records request on the City's website. Subsequent to receiving the August 9, 2022 Grand Jury Report, the City Clerk and Communications Staff have worked on creating and posting a fillable PRA-specific request online form on the City's website, which form should be available by November 1, 2022. The form will be accessible via multiple channels through the website:

October 21, 2022

Page 2

- Via the City Clerk webpage under the sub-heading "Public Records Request"
- Via the "Online Services..." icon listed on the home page under the sub-heading "Public Records Request"
- Via the Government Tab under the sub-heading "Public Records Request"

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**R2. The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.**

Response: The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future. The City Clerk will be researching various vendors of records request software for potential use. The current FY2022-23 budget does not include funds for this software but may be included in future. Staff intends to have quotes for services from vendors by early 2023, discuss the issue with City departments and make a recommendation as to whether to include it in the FT 23/24 budget based on its cost and its usefulness to the City.

**R3. By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.**

Response: As indicated in Finding 3, this recommendation will be implemented by November 1, 2022.

**R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."**

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future. Staff has worked with records management vendors to routinely do annual public record "cleanups" in the summer where public records which are due for destruction are identified. City Clerk and staff will work with City Departments to hold more "records clean up days" throughout the year. By June 30, 2023, the City Clerk will also explore ways to increase staff capacity and technological resources dedicated to supporting "Records Clean Up Day".

**R5. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to create, on the city clerk's page of its website, a submittable PRA request form.**

Response: As indicated in Finding 5, this recommendation will be implemented by November 1, 2023.

Respectfully,



Coleen Mackin  
Mayor  
City of Brisbane



## The City of Burlingame

RICARDO ORTIZ, MAYOR  
MICHAEL BROWNRIGG, VICE MAYOR  
DONNA COLSON  
EMILY BEACH  
ANN O'BRIEN KEIGHRAN

CITY HALL -- 501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA 94010-3997

TEL: (650) 558-7201  
[www.burlingame.org](http://www.burlingame.org)

October 3, 2022

The Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

**Subject: City of Burlingame's response to Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"**

Dear Judge Lee:

After reviewing the Grand Jury entitled "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know," the following are the City of Burlingame's responses to the Grand Jury's recommendations:

***Recommendation R2 has been implemented.***

The City utilized Laserfiche forms in order to create its own unique public records request portal. This portal went live January 2021 and acts in the same manner as commercially available public records request software. The portal link can be found on the City's homepage under "Government" or under "Popular Links." Additionally, the portal link is included on each department's webpage.

Staff is in the process of moving hard copies of records into the Laserfiche records management system. This allows staff to easily find records and more quickly answer public records request. Additionally, by creating the public portal through Laserfiche, once a records request is answered, it is automatically saved into the records management system. Therefore, it meets the State requirement of retaining public records requests for two years under Government Code Section 34090. Additionally, it saves staff time and allows staff to quickly sort through records requests.

***Recommendation R4 has been partially implemented.***

The City Clerk's Office meets regularly with the different departments to:

- review the retention schedule
- create templates in order to move documents into Laserfiche
- create Laserfiche forms in order that documents are created in Laserfiche and then automatically stored
- assist in determining whether records should be boxed and moved to the City's off-site facility or whether they can be scanned into Laserfiche with the hardcopy destroyed

Additionally, most records are maintained in Laserfiche by year. This allows for quick yearly scans to properly destroy electronic versions of documents that are past their retention. The City Clerk performs this task on behalf of all departments.

However, the City Clerk's Office is always looking for new and innovative ways to make record retention/storage fun and exciting. The City Clerk's Office will coordinate with the administrative assistants in each department to establish a day each summer when record questions can be answered, templates created, documents properly destroyed, and documents shipped to off-site storage. A plan will be implemented to coordinate this event with the end of each fiscal year, June 30.

The Burlingame City Council approved this response letter at its public meeting on October 3, 2021.

Sincerely,



Ricardo Ortiz  
Mayor



## OFFICE OF THE CITY COUNCIL *City of Foster City*

October 4, 2022

Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2nd Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

RE: RESPONSE OF THE CITY OF FOSTER CITY TO THE GRAND JURY REPORT "DELICATE BALANCE BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE AND POWER: GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY AND THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW"

Honorable Judge Lee:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report filed on August 9, 2022. The report identified a requested response for Finding 2 (F2) and Recommendation 4 (R4). The City of Foster City's response to both the finding and recommendation as requested are detailed below.

### Response to Grand Jury Findings

F2: The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

- The City agrees with this finding and has implemented a web portal enabling the public to request records.

### Response to Grand Recommendations

R4: By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

- The City has implemented this recommendation and hosts a "Free the Files Day" regularly. "Free the Files Day" is an opportunity to assist Records Coordinators with reviewing files, identifying records for off-site storage,

City of Foster City • 610 Foster City Boulevard, Foster City, CA 94404  
P: (650) 286-3200 • F: (650) 577-0983 • E: [council@fostercity.org](mailto:council@fostercity.org)

identifying records for destruction per the Retention Schedule, and completing the associated destruction notices for review and approval by the City Clerk and City Attorney. The next "Free the Files Day" is anticipated to take place in January 2023.

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05 and the Brown Act, this response to the Grand Jury was approved by Minute Order at a public meeting on October 3, 2022.


Respectfully,

*Richa Awasthi*

Richa Awasthi (Oct 6, 2022 15:46 CDT)

Richa Awasthi

Mayor, City of Foster City



City of Foster City • 610 Foster City Boulevard, Foster City, CA 94404  
P: (650) 286-3200 • F: (650) 577-0983 • E: council@fostercity.org

# MINUTE ORDER

**No. 1879**

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
FOSTER CITY, CALIFORNIA


Date: October 4, 2022

Attention: City Council/EMID Board  
Stefan Chatwin, City/District Manager  
Yelena Cappello, Acting Communications Director/City Clerk

City Council/EMID Board of Directors Meeting Date: October 3, 2022

Subject: Response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report, Dated August 9, 2022, Entitled "Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Motion by Councilmember Gehani, seconded by Vice Mayor Froomin, and carried unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0-0, IT WAS ORDERED, to approve the response to the Honorable Amarra A. Lee Judge of the Superior Court in Response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report, Dated August 9, 2022, Entitled "Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know".

DocuSigned by:  
  
7CD6E52A6378484...

---

CITY CLERK/DISTRICT SECRETARY  
BY: YELENA CAPPELLO, ACTING CITY  
CLERK/DISTRICT SECRETARY





November 1, 2022

The Honorable Judge Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
C/O Jenarda Dubois, Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
San Mateo County Superior Court, Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

**RE: Civil Grand Jury Report: “A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know.”**

Dear Honorable Judge Lee:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report issued on August 9, 2022. The City of Menlo Park’s responses to both the findings and recommendations are listed below. Please note the Grand Jury Report requested responses from the City of Menlo Park only as to Findings 1 and 2, and Recommendations 1, 3, and 4.

**Response to Grand Jury Findings**

- F1.** The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.

**City Response:** *The respondent agrees with the finding. The City is in the process of adopting such policies and procedures; however, the City handles all PRA requests pursuant to State law which requires substantial consistency in the response to all PRA requests.*

- F2.** The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**City Response:** *The respondent agrees with the finding.*

**Response to Grand Jury Recommendations**

- R1.** The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedure document for circulation to all relevant staff.

**City Response:** *The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. Prior to receiving the Grand Jury Report City staff had already drafted procedures for processing public records act requests. City staff have been operating under these procedures for the entirety of 2022 and finds that the processing of requests have improved. City staff plans to review, and where appropriate, revise the procedures in order to more efficiently meet the obligations of the CPRA. No formal adoption of these procedures is required. However, City staff will report to Council prior to June 30, 2023, on the written policies and procedures.*

- R3.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.

**City Response:** *The recommendation has not yet been implemented. However, the city anticipates complying with this recommendation by June 30, 2023, and likely well before.*

- R4.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**City Response:** *This recommendation will not be implemented. Currently the City has a program for completing routine records destruction with individual city departments, which complies with State laws regarding records destruction. The timelines for retention and destruction of various records are determined based on subject matter and reference relevant State law requirements. The process involves the city clerk's office working with individual departments to list records proposed for destruction and the city clerk then brings those to the City Council for approval, and eventual destruction with an outside vendor. This process has proven effective. Further, there is not currently a budget for creating a "Records Destruction Day" with food trucks and other amenities. The City will continue to review whether creating a "Records Cleanup Day" by department or in another similar fashion is a desirable route in future years.*

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05 and the Brown Act, this response was considered and acted on by motion of the City Council at a public meeting on November 1, 2022. Should you have any questions concerning this response, please contact City Clerk Judi Herren at [jaherren@menlopark.org](mailto:jaherren@menlopark.org).

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

*Betsy Nash*

445F4B216DBE480...  
Betsy Nash

Mayor



Scenic Pacifica  
Incorporated Nov. 22, 1957

---

## CITY OF PACIFICA

540 Crespi Drive • Pacifica, California 94044-3422  
[www.cityofpacifica.org](http://www.cityofpacifica.org)

---

**MAYOR**  
Mary Bier

**MAYOR PRO TEM**  
Tygarjas Bigstycck

**COUNCIL**  
Mike O'Neill  
Sue Vaterlaus  
Sue Beckmeyer

October 24, 2022

The Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Email: [grandjury@sanmateocourt.org](mailto:grandjury@sanmateocourt.org)

**Subject: City of Pacifica's response to "Grand Jury Report: 'A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know'"**

Dear Judge Lee:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above-referenced Grand Jury report filed on August 9, 2022. Pursuant to Penal Code § 933(c), the City of Pacifica's response to the findings and recommendations contained in the report and indicated in the "Request for Responses" selected for the City of Pacifica are provided below. The Pacifica City Council, including the Mayor, reviewed and approved the responses at a public meeting held on October 24, 2022.

**Responses to Grand Jury Findings Selected for Pacifica:**

**F2.** The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**Response to F2.** The City agrees with the finding.

**Responses to Grand Jury Recommendations Selected for Pacifica:**

**R4.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**Response to R4.** This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented by June 30, 2023, with the city council directing staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day." Thereafter, city staff would review a records management practice consistent with the City of Pacifica's Administrative Policy No. 8 "Records Management and Information Management Program Policy" in which the City Clerk leads outreach to city departments and staff to emphasize a

Subject: City of Pacifica's response to "Grand Jury Report: 'A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know'"

October 24, 2022

commitment to educate and facilitate coordinated activities to document the annual clean-up, organization and purging of records in accordance with the City of Pacifica Record Retention Schedules. The City of Pacifica's goal will be analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Clean-up Day" as illustrated in Appendix F of the Grand Jury Report, "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know." The City of Pacifica agrees that the practice of an annual "Records Cleanup Day" and related activities emphasizes the importance of effective records management practices in a supportive environment that the agency conducts annually while also encouraging practices in routine records management activities that make the annual practice less burdensome.

Sincerely,



KEVIN WOODHOUSE  
City Manager

cc: Pacifica City Council

Mayor Giselle Hale  
Vice Mayor Diana Reddy

Council Members  
Alicia C. Aguirre  
Lissette Espinoza-Garnica  
Jeff Gee  
Diane Howard  
Elmer Martinez Saballos



1017 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone (650) 780-7220  
www.redwoodcity.org

October 7, 2022

Hon. Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

**Re: San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report titled “A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know” – Filed on August 9, 2022**

Dear Judge Lee,

The City of Redwood City (City) received the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report titled “A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know” on August 15, 2022. The report instructed the City of Redwood City to respond to one finding, F2, and to two recommendations, R3 and R4. Pursuant to Penal Code §933.05, the following response to the Grand Jury was reviewed and approved by the City Council at its meeting on October 3, 2022:

**Findings**

F2. The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**Response: Agree. The City implemented a commercially available public records request web portal, NextRequest, in March 2021 to automate and centralize the submittal, records retrieval, internal processing and response to all public records request.**

**Recommendations**

R3. By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city’s official website.

**Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by October 31, 2022.**

R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo’s “Records Cleanup Day.”

**Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by June 30, 2023.**

The City of Redwood City continues to strive for excellence in government operations by improving the public's access to records while increasing efficiency in records maintenance and information governance. On October 13, 2021, the City adopted Administrative Policy No. 58, *Policy for Processing Public Records Act Requests* to prescribe guidelines and best practices for handling public records requests. Additionally, the City Clerk's Office will regularly evaluate its recordkeeping processes and provide city departments with guidance and efficiency tools to properly maintain records citywide.

On behalf of the City Council of the City of Redwood City, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above reference Grand Jury Report.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Giselle", is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

Giselle Hale  
Mayor  
City of Redwood City

Cc: City Council, City of Redwood City  
Melissa Stevenson Diaz, City Manager  
Pamela Aguilar, City Clerk



Rico E. Medina  
Mayor

October 12, 2022

Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2nd Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Subject: Response of the City of San Bruno to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report  
"A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the  
Public's Right to Know"

Dear Judge Lee,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Grand Jury report entitled "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know." The City of San Bruno's response to its allocated findings and recommendations are listed below.

**Responses to Allocated Grand Jury Findings:**

**F3. Information about how to access public records requires multiple click to find on the City's website, which hinders the public's access to public records.**

*Response:*

Partially Disagree. Information to access public records can be accessed with one click from the City's website. However, there are multiple ways to access such information, some of which can take multiple clicks.

**F5. The City has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.**

*Response:*

Disagree. The City's official website has the following PRA request form with clear access links allowing the public to efficiently submit a request: <https://www.sanbruno.ca.gov/214/Public-Records-Request>.

**Responses to Allocated Grand Jury Recommendations:**

The 2021-2022 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the City of San Bruno do the following:

**R2. The City Council should direct City staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.**

*Response:*

Agree. City Council will direct City staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and to report back to Council by September 1, 2023 regarding the purchase of commercially available public records request software.

**R3. By June 30, 2023, the City Council should consider directing City staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the City's official website.**

*Response:*

Agree. At the time of this response, staff has added to the homepage of its official website a single link to the City's Public Records Act webpage.

**R4. By June 30, 2023, the City Council should direct City staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."**

*Response:*

Agree. City Council will direct staff to adopt a formal practice that prompts staff to manage records in accordance with the City's existing record retention policy.

This response was approved by the San Bruno City Council at a public meeting prior to it being submitted to the court.

Sincerely,



Rico E. Medina  
Mayor



CITY OF SAN CARLOS  
CITY CLERK



600 ELM STREET  
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070  
(650) 802-4219  
CITYOFSANCARLOS.ORG

October 28, 2022

Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Hon. Amarra A. Lee:

The City of San Carlos hereby submits its response to the response to the 2021-2022 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report titled "*A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know.*"

This response was approved by the San Carlos City Council at its regular public meeting of October 24, 2022.

**Finding 2: The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.**

**Response:** The City of San Carlos agrees with the finding. Such software was implemented in November of 2021. <https://cityofsancarlos-ca.nextrequest.com/>

**Recommendation 4: By June 30, 2023, the City Council should direct staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."**

**Response:** This recommendation has been implemented. Every year, the City Clerk's office reviews hardcopy records stored offsite to determine what records are ready for destruction (pursuant to the City's records retention schedule). Records that are ready for destruction are prepared and properly destroyed.

Additionally, for the past decade, staff has made great stride in digitizing its historical records, making it easier to not only access records remotely, but to keep on top of the City's records retention schedule.

Staff will continue to review its records management practices and make further enhancements to the process as necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Maltbie, City Manager



CITY OF SAN MATEO  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

330 W. 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
San Mateo, CA 94403-1338  
[www.cityofsanmateo.org](http://www.cityofsanmateo.org)  
(650) 522-7040

October 17, 2022

Hon. Amara A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Re: Response to Civil Grand Jury Report: "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power:  
Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Honorable Judge Lee,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report filed on August 9, 2022. The City of San Mateo's response is it agrees with the findings and notes that the City of San Mateo had no identified recommendations and therefore nothing further to implement.

As a City, we will continue to emulate best practices to ensure responsiveness to the California Public Records Act.

Thank you for your feedback.

Respectfully,

*Rick Bonilla*

Rick Bonilla  
Mayor, City of San Mateo



OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
ROSA GOVEA ACOSTA

October 20, 2022

Hon. Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2nd Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Subject: CITY OF SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO'S RESPONSE TO THE 2021-22 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT TITLED "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Honorable Judge Lee,

The South San Francisco City Council approved this letter at its City Council meeting on October 26, 2022.

Below is the City of South San Francisco's response to the 2021-22 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know."

Grand Jury Finding:

F2: The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**The City of South San Francisco agrees with the finding.**

Grand Jury Recommendation:

R4: By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, by June 30, 2023.**

If you have any questions, please contact me at (650) 877-8518.

Sincerely,

  
Rosa Govea Acosta  
City Clerk



## TOWN OF COLMA

1198 El Camino Real • Colma, California • 94014-3212  
Tel 650.997.8300 • Fax 650.997.8308

October 13, 2022

Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Re: Grand Jury Report: "A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency And The Public's Right To Know."

Dear Judge Lee:

The City Council received the San Mateo Civil Grand Jury report titled, "A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency And The Public's Right To Know."

The Town was requested to submit comments regarding the findings and recommendations within 90 days and no later than November 9, 2022. The Town of Colma's response to both the findings and recommendations are listed below.

The Grand Jury instructed the Town of Colma to respond to recommendations R2 and R4.

For each Grand Jury "recommendation", the Town was requested to report one of the following actions;

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.
4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation therefore.

Helen Fisicaro, Mayor  
Joanne F. del Rosario, Vice Mayor  
John Irish Goodwin, Council Member • Diana Colvin, Council Member • Ken Gonzalez, Council Member  
Brian Dossey, City Manager

**The following are responses to recommendations R2 and R 4:**

**R2.** The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.

**Town Response:** This recommendation will not be implemented. The Town receives a minimal number of public records request and staff has not encountered any difficulties with providing timely responses. The Town does not find it necessary to perform cost/benefit analysis or look into acquiring a commercially available public records request software.

**R4.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**Town Response:** This recommendation has been implemented. Staff will look into implementing a similar records clean up event by June 30, 2023.

This response was approved by the City Council at the October 12, 2022 public meeting.

On behalf of the Town of Colma, I would like to thank the Grand Jury for their work on this report.

Sincerely,



Helen Fisicaro  
Mayor



**TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH**  
*California*

October 11, 2022

Honorable Amara A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Re: Grand Jury Report: “A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know”

Honorable Judge Lee:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report released on August 9, 2022. The Town of Hillsborough’s response to both the findings and recommendations are listed below.

**FINDINGS:**

**F1. The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.**

*Response: The respondent partially disagrees with the Finding. While the Town has no formal written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, the Town is a small agency and staff are aware and routinely reminded of the process through training and communications from the City Clerk. The City Clerk logs and tracks all records requests and works closely with the City Attorney to review records and respond to all requests per the timelines specified in the Public Records Act.*

**F3. Information about how to access public records requires multiple clicks to find on the city's website, which hinders the public's access to public records.**

*Response: The respondent disagrees with this Finding. Using the search term “records” yields the Town’s “Public Records Center” page as the first result. In addition, from the Town’s home page, after clicking on “City Clerk” from the Departments list, “Public Records Center” is a link in the left menu of the page. In response to this finding, the term “Records” have been added to the list of options under the “I Want To” menu on the Town’s home page.*

**F5. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.**

*Response: The respondent partially disagrees with the Finding. While the Town had no Public Records Act request form at the time that the report was issued, a form is not required per the Public Records Act and the current process of emailing, mailing or providing verbal requests to the City Clerk has been efficient. However, to respond to this finding, the City Clerk created a form and posted it on the Town website on September 14, 2022.*

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**R1. The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.**

*Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented operationally by staff by January 31, 2023.*

**R2. The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.**

*Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted at this time. The Town acknowledges that software could be beneficial but is currently implementing other software to provide the public with easier access to Council meeting documents and agenda items. Staff will continue to review the volume and complexity of records requests and will evaluate the need for a commercially available public records request software in the future, including performance of a cost/benefit analysis for presentation to the City Council at that time.*

**R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."**

*Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future and by June 30, 2023, following Council adoption of the Town's updated records retention schedule.*

**R5. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to create, on the city clerk's page of its website, a submittable PRA request form.**

*Response: The recommendation has been implemented operationally by staff. The City Clerk created a form and posted it on the Town website on September 14, 2022.*

This response to the Grand Jury was approved by the Town of Hillsborough City Council at a public meeting on October 10, 2022.

Respectfully,



Alvin L. Royse  
Mayor, Town of Hillsborough



# TOWN of PORTOLA VALLEY

Town Hall: 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028 - Tel: (650) 851-1700 Fax: (650) 851-4677

October 26, 2022

Honorable Amara A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Re: Grand Jury Report - "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Honorable Judge Lee,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report issued on August 9, 2022. Please find the Town of Portola Valley's response to both the findings and recommendations below.

## **FINDINGS:**

**F3. Information about how to access public records requires multiple clicks to find on the city's website, which hinders the public's access to public records.**

*Response: The respondent agrees with this finding, and this information is located in one click from first accessing the homepage of the Town website by hovering over the "I Want To..." tab located on the top ribbon of the page and clicking on "Access Public Records". This will take the viewer to a webpage detailed in R3 of this response.*

**F5. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.**

*Response: The respondent agrees with this finding, and subsequent to receiving the August 9, 2022 Grand Jury Report, the Town Clerk created and posted a fillable form on the Town's website in September 2022, and it is accessible via multiple channels through the website:*

- *Via the Town Clerk webpage under the sub-header "Records Requests"*
- *Via the "I Want To..." tab listed on the home page*

*However, it is also worth noting that as of September 2022 the Public Records Act does not require a form for records requests.*

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**R2. The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.**

*Response: The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future. Although the current volume of records requests has been properly managed by staff at the time this response was written, the Town Clerk has been researching various vendors of records request software for potential use moving forward. However, the current FY2022-23 budget does not include funds for this software, but may be amended if necessary, or included in the FY2023-24 budget. Staff intends to have quotes for services from vendors by early 2023 and a decision regarding implementation soon thereafter.*



*It is the intention of staff to have records request software in use by September 1, 2023, provided it is cost effective.*

**R3. By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.**

*Response: This recommendation is in the process of being implemented, with an expected date for public use by early 2023. The Town is creating a webpage accessible from the homepage via the "I Want To..." tab with a link entitled "Access Public Records".*

**R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."**

*Response: This recommendation has been implemented. Staff routinely conducts "quarterly cleanups" where permanent records and records which are due for destruction are identified.*

**R5. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to create, on the city clerk's page of its website, a submittable PRA request form.**

*Response: The recommendation has been implemented operationally by staff, in response to this report. The Town Clerk created a fillable form and posted it on the Town website on September 30, 2022. The form is accessible via multiple channels through the website:*

- *Via the Town Clerk webpage under the sub-header "Records Requests"*
- *Via the "I Want To..." tab listed on the home page*


This response to the Grand Jury was approved by the Town of Portola Valley Town Council at a public meeting on October 26, 2022.

Respectfully,



---

Craig Hughes  
Mayor  
Town of Portola Valley



The Town of  
Woodside

October 12, 2022

The Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

**RE: 2021-22 GRAND JURY REPORT - *A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and The Public's Right to Know***

Dear Judge Lee:

The Town Council of the Town of Woodside wishes to thank the 2021-22 Grand Jury for its service. The Town Council has reviewed the report entitled *A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and The Public's Right to Know* and reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury at its public meeting of October 11, 2022, and approved the following response:

**FINDINGS**

1. The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.

Response: The Town agrees with this finding. Although there is written documentation of the PRA, there has yet to be formal written documentation on internal procedures.

2. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.

Response: The Town disagrees with this finding. On Page 11 of the report, Woodside's website was not listed as one of the four having no such form. Woodside's form may be found at:  
<https://www.woodsidetown.org/building/public-records-request>.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.

Response: The Town will implement this recommendation by June 30, 2023.

2. The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.

P.O. Box 620005  
2955 Woodside Road  
Woodside CA 94062

650-851-6790

Fax: 650-851-2195

townhall@woodsidetown.org

Response: The Town will implement this recommendation by September 1, 2023.

3. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

Response: The Town will implement this recommendation by June 30, 2023.

On behalf of the Town Council, I would like to extend our thanks for the opportunity to review and respond to the work of the 2021-22 Grand Jury.

Please do not hesitate to call Town Manager Kevin Bryant, at (650) 851-6790, should you require any further information.

Sincerely,



Richard "Dick" Brown  
Mayor



*City of Millbrae*  
621 Magnolia Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030

ANNE OLIVA  
Mayor

GINA PAPAN  
Vice Mayor

ANDERS FUNG  
Councilmember

REUBEN D. HOLOBER  
Councilmember

ANN SCHNEIDER  
Councilmember

October 25, 2022

Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois, Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2nd Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

RE: **City of Millbrae’s Response to Grand Jury Report: "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know”**

Dear Honorable Amarra A. Lee,

Please accept this as the City of Millbrae’s formal response to the Grand Jury Report: "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know” (Grand Jury Report), pursuant to the instructions in your August 9, 2022 letter.

The City has reviewed the Grand Jury Report at the October 25, 2022 City Council meeting and offers the following responses to the findings and recommendations on behalf of the City Council by 5-0 approval by roll call vote:

**Response to Finding:**

F2. The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

Response: The City agrees with this finding. The City utilizes Laserfiche’s electronic forms as its public records request portal (portal). The portal functions similarly to commercially available public records request software. When a request is received, the portal automatically acknowledges and provides an update on the request within ten days. The portal is accessible on the City’s main webpage under “Public Records & Information.”

**Response to Recommendation:**

R4. By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo’s “Records Cleanup Day.”

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future by June 30, 2023.

October 25, 2022

RE: City of Millbrae's Response to Grand Jury Report: "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power:  
Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Page 2 of 2

The City appreciates the opportunity to share its comments on the Grand Jury Report.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
  
53B7E96806224DC...  
Anne E. Oliva  
Mayor

Cc: City Council  
City Manager  
City Attorney



# CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO

## Office of the Mayor

---

October 4, 2022

Honorable Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

RE: Civil Grand Jury Report: "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Dear Judge Lee:

The City Council of the City of East Palo Alto (City) voted at its public meeting on October 4, 2022, to authorize this response to San Mateo County's civil grand jury 2021-2022 report "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

### RESPONSES TO FINDINGS

**F1.** The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.

**City Response:** The City of East Palo Alto disagrees with this finding. The City has implemented a PRA policy that is adhered to by the appropriate departments.

**F2.** The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**City Response:** The City of East Palo Alto agrees with this finding. The City has integrated a ticketing system that residents can access directly through the City website to submit Public Records Requests online.

**F3.** Information about how to access public records requires multiple clicks to find on the city's website, which hinders the public's access to public records.

**City Response:** The City of East Palo Alto agrees with this finding.

**F4.** The City of San Mateo implements a Records Cleanup Day with the purpose of increasing employee understanding of the need to effectively maintain public records, thereby improving PRA request responsiveness.

**City Response:** The City of East Palo Alto disagrees with this finding.

F5. The city has no PRA request form online, making public access to public records less efficient.

### **RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

**R1.** The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.

**City Response:** This recommendation has been implemented. The City of East Palo Alto currently has a PRA policy in place.

**R2.** The city council should direct city staff to consider performing a cost/benefit analysis and report back by September 1, 2023, on the purchase of commercially available public records request software.

**City Response:** Will be completed by March 31, 2023.

**R3.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.

**City Response:** Will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**R4.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**City Response:** Will be completed by February 28, 2022.

**R5.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to create, on the city clerk's page of its website, a submittable PRA request form.

**City Response:** This recommendation has been implemented. The City of East Palo Alto currently has a submittable PRA request for on its city website.

Sincerely,

---

**Ruben Abrica**  
Mayor  
City of East Palo Alto



November 1, 2022

The Honorable Judge Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
C/O Jenarda Dubois, Civil Grand Jury Coordinator  
San Mateo County Superior Court, Hall of Justice  
400 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

**RE: Civil Grand Jury Report: “A Delicate Balance Between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public’s Right to Know.”**

Dear Honorable Judge Lee:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced Grand Jury Report issued on August 9, 2022. The City of Menlo Park’s responses to both the findings and recommendations are listed below. Please note the Grand Jury Report requested responses from the City of Menlo Park only as to Findings 1 and 2, and Recommendations 1, 3, and 4.

**Response to Grand Jury Findings**

- F1.** The city has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests could be handled inconsistently.

**City Response:** *The respondent agrees with the finding. The City is in the process of adopting such policies and procedures; however, the City handles all PRA requests pursuant to State law which requires substantial consistency in the response to all PRA requests.*

- F2.** The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**City Response:** *The respondent agrees with the finding.*

**Response to Grand Jury Recommendations**

- R1.** The city council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedure document for circulation to all relevant staff.

**City Response:** *The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. Prior to receiving the Grand Jury Report City staff had already drafted procedures for processing public records act requests. City staff have been operating under these procedures for the entirety of 2022 and finds that the processing of requests have improved. City staff plans to review, and where appropriate, revise the procedures in order to more efficiently meet the obligations of the CPRA. No formal adoption of these procedures is required. However, City staff will report to Council prior to June 30, 2023, on the written policies and procedures.*



- R3.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to place information about how to access public records on the home page of the city's official website.

**City Response:** *The recommendation has not yet been implemented. However, the city anticipates complying with this recommendation by June 30, 2023, and likely well before.*


- R4.** By June 30, 2023, the city council should direct city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**City Response:** *This recommendation will not be implemented. Currently the City has a program for completing routine records destruction with individual city departments, which complies with State laws regarding records destruction. The timelines for retention and destruction of various records are determined based on subject matter and reference relevant State law requirements. The process involves the city clerk's office working with individual departments to list records proposed for destruction and the city clerk then brings those to the City Council for approval, and eventual destruction with an outside vendor. This process has proven effective. Further, there is not currently a budget for creating a "Records Destruction Day" with food trucks and other amenities. The City will continue to review whether creating a "Records Cleanup Day" by department or in another similar fashion is a desirable route in future years.*

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05 and the Brown Act, this response was considered and acted on by motion of the City Council at a public meeting on November 1, 2022. Should you have any questions concerning this response, please contact City Clerk Judi Herren at [jaherren@menlopark.org](mailto:jaherren@menlopark.org).

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:



445F4B216DBE480...  
Betsy Nash

Mayor



# OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER CITY OF DALY CITY

333 – 90<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
DALY CITY, CA 94015-1895  
(650) 991-8127

September 21, 2022

Hon. Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois, Chief Grand Jury Coordinator  
Hall of Justice  
400 County Center; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063-

RE: Civil Grand Jury Report "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know"

Dear Judge Lee:

On September 12, 2022, the City Council of Daly City, approved and authorized the City Manager to submit for the City the following responses to the Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations pertaining to the above referenced report: "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know."

## **FINDINGS**

### **Finding #1**

The City has no written documentation of its PRA policy and internal procedures, making it more likely that requests will be handled inconsistently.

### **Response**

The City **agrees** with this finding. The Police Department adopted a "Records Maintenance and Release" Policy, (Policy No. 809) which provides guidance on the maintenance and release of Police Department records. The City does not have a City-wide Public Records Requests written internal policy or procedures. The City does have a Records Management Retention Guidelines, which provides guidance to individual departments on the records retention legal requirements.

Hon. Amarra A. Lee  
Judge of the Superior Court  
c/o Jenarda Dubois, Chief Grand Jury Coordinator  
Page 2

All PRA's submitted on the City's website are automatically sent to the City Attorney's Office for review and processing. The City Attorney's Office responds to all requests for information accordance with the California Public Records Act and responses are consistent with state law.

**Finding #2**

The city uses a commercially available software application that includes a web portal enabling the public to easily request records and track their disposition.

**Response**

The City **agrees** with this finding.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation #1**

The City Council should direct city staff to consider and report back by June 30, 2023, on the creation of a written PRA policy or procedures document for circulation to all relevant staff.

**Response**

The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future by June 30, 2023.

**Recommendation #4**

By June 30, 2023, the city council should consider directing city staff to review and consider adopting a records management practice analogous to the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day."

**Response**

The recommendation requires further analysis, and the City will review the City of San Mateo's "Records Cleanup Day" and consult with all Departments as to the feasibility of implementing this recommendation.

The City of Daly City appreciates the opportunity to provide written responses to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report "A Delicate Balance between Knowledge and Power: Government Transparency and the Public's Right to Know." The City Council of Daly City approved the responses contained herein on September 12, 2022.

Should you or the Grand Jury require additional information, please contact me directly at (650) 991-8127.

Very Truly Yours,



Thomas Piccolotti  
Interim City Manager