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INTRODUCTION

There are various laws in place to prevent councilmembers from participating in decision in which they have a disqualifying conflict of interest. The purpose of such laws and regulations is to ensure that all actions are taken in the public interest. This handout discuss some of the major rules governing conflicts of interest. If at any time a Councilmember believes a potential for conflict of interest exists, he/she is encouraged to consult with the City Attorney as soon as possible. Violations of these rules may result in significant penalties including fines or criminal prosecution.

I. POLITICAL REFORM ACT

The Political Reform Act of 1974 was adopted by initiative as a response to the "Watergate" scandals and is contained in Government Code Sections 81000 et seq. It is the primary source of statutory law in California regarding conflicts. The Political Reform Act regulates disqualification of government officials due to conflicts of interest. In addition, it also regulates reporting and disclosure of economic interests; gift and honoraria limits; and, to a limited extent, campaign contributions. The Political Reform Act establishes the Fair Political Practices Commission ("the FPPC") as the State agency charged with its enforcement. FPPC regulations implementing the Political Reform Act are found at 2 Cal. Code of Regulations ("CCR") §18110 et seq.

A. GENERAL RULE REGARDING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No public official at any level of government shall make, participate in making or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which the official knows, or has reason to know, he or she has a financial interest. (Gov. Code § 87100.) The purpose of the Political Reform Act is to ensure officials perform their duties in an impartial manner, free from bias caused by their own financial interests or the interests of persons who have supported them.

B. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST UNDER THE POLITICAL REFORM ACT

An official has a conflict of interest under the Political Reform Act when it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect on an economic interest of the official or a member of his or her immediate family. A public official has a disqualifying financial interest if the decision will have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from the effect on the public generally, directly on the official, or his or her immediate family, or on any financial interest of the official or his or her immediately family. (2. Cal. Code Regs. § 18700(a).) A public official’s immediate family includes his or her spouse and dependent children.

A public official has a financial interest in anything or anyone listed below, including if such interest is held by a member of the official’s immediate family:

Business Investments: A public official has an economic interest in a business entity, operated for profit, in which he or she has a direct or indirect investment of $2,000 or more.
Business Management Positions: A public official has an economic interest in any business entity, operated for profit, in which he or she holds a position as a director, official, partner, trustee or any position of management.

Real Property: A public official has an interest in real property when the official, spouse or dependent children have a direct or indirect equity, option or leasehold interest of $2,000 or more in a parcel of property located in, or within two miles of, the geographical jurisdiction of the official's agency.

Sources of Income: A public official has an economic interest in any person or entity from whom he/she has received income aggregating $520 within 12 months prior to the time when the relevant governmental decision is made. Income includes income which has been promised to the public official but not yet received by him or her, if he or she has a legally enforceable right to the promised income. (Gov. Code § 87103).

PRACTICE TIP: The Political Reform Act does not include income received from government entities as "income". As a consequence, a public official usually has no conflict of interest under the Political Reform Act even when the decision affects his or her government employer, unless another economic interest is also involved. WARNING: Government Code Section 1090 does not exclude government salaries from its definition of "financial interest".

Sources of Gifts: A public official has an economic interest in any donor of, or any intermediary or agent for a donor of, a gift or gifts aggregating $520 or more in value provided to, received by, or promised to the public official within 12 months prior to the time when the decision is made.

PRACTICE TIP: The gift limitation amount is adjusted by the FPPC every two years.

Personal Financial Effects: A public official has an economic interest in his or her personal expenses, income, assets, or liabilities, and those of his or her immediate family.

C. COMPONENTS OF A POLITICAL REFORM ACT CONFLICT OF INTEREST

FPPC regulations establish a 4-step process for determining whether or not a conflict of interest exists in any given case. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18700 et seq.) A public official seeking to determine whether or not he or she has a conflict of interest should make the following determinations:

Step One: Is the financial effect on the public official's financial interest "reasonably foreseeable" with the meaning of the PRA?

FPPC regulations require that it be "reasonably foreseeable" that a decision will have a financial effect on a financial interest of the public official in order for a conflict of
interest to exist. A financial effect is presumed to be reasonably foreseeable if the financial interest is a named party in, the subject of, or otherwise explicitly involved in a governmental decision before the official or the official’s agency. (2. Cal. Code Regs. § 18701(a).)

If a financial interest is not explicitly involved in a governmental decision, a financial effect is reasonably foreseeable if the financial effect is a realistic possibility and more than hypothetical or theoretical. Various factors may be considered in determining whether a governmental decision will have a reasonably foreseeable financial effect on a financial interest not explicitly involved in a governmental decision. Factors include, but are not limited to, the extent to which the occurrence of the financial effect is contingent upon intervening events, outside the control of the public official or the public official’s agency and whether the public official should anticipate a financial effect on his or her financial interest as a potential outcome of the governmental decision under normal circumstances. (2. Cal. Code Regs. § 18701(b).)

Step Two: Is the financial effect material?

A public official may not participate in a governmental decision if the reasonably foreseeable financial effect on the official’s financial interest is material. The rules for determining whether the financial effect is material differ depending on the type of financial interest involved.

- If the decision involves a financial interest in a business entity:

  The financial effect is material if, among other reasons, the business entity bids on or enters into a contract with the official’s agency or applies for a permit, license, grant or other entitlement from the official’s agency. (2. Cal. Code Regs. § 18702.1.)

- If the decision involves a financial interest in real property:

  The financial effect is material if, among other reasons, the governmental decision would determine the property’s zoning, or would affect the property value of any parcel located within 500 feet of the official’s property. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18702.2.)

- If the decision involves a financial interest in a source of income:

  The financial effect is material if, among other reasons, the source of income is the applicant, respondent, contracting party or otherwise named or identified as the subject of the proceeding before the official’s agency. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18702.3.)

- If the decision involves a financial interest in a source of gifts:
The financial effect is material if, among other reasons, the source of the gift is the applicant, respondent, contracting party or otherwise named or identified as the subject of the proceeding before the official's agency. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18702.4.)

- If the decision involves a financial interest in the public official's personal finances or those of his or her immediate family:

The financial effect is material if, among other reasons, the official or the official's immediate family member will receive a measurable financial benefit or loss from the decision. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18702.5.)

The factors listed under each type of financial interest above are not exhaustive, and are only examples. Please review the applicable regulation or contact legal counsel for complete information.

Step Three: Is the effect on the official the same as on the “public generally”?

A public official does not have a conflict of interest if the material financial effect on the official's interest is indistinguishable from the decisions effect on the public generally. A governmental decision's financial effect on a public official's financial interest is indistinguishable from its effect on the public generally if a significant segment of the public is affected. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18703.)

A significant segment of the public is at least 25 percent of:

1. All businesses or non-profit entities within the official's jurisdiction;
2. All real property, commercial real property, or residential real property within the official's jurisdiction; or
3. All individuals within the official's jurisdiction.

Even if a significant segment of the public is affected, the decision is not indistinguishable if the decision's effect on the official's financial interest is not unique compared to the effect on the significant segment. A unique effect includes, among other things, a disproportionate effect on the development potential or use of the official's real property or on the income producing potential of the official's real property or business entity.

Step Four: Is the official “making, participating in the making, or using his or her position to influence” the governmental decision from which the financial effects result?

A public official makes a governmental decision if the official authorizes or directs any action, votes, appoints a person, obligates or commits his or her agency to any course of action, or enters into any contractual agreement on behalf of his or her agency. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18704(a).) A public official participates in a governmental decision if the official provides information, an opinion, or a recommendation for the purpose of affecting the decision without
significant intervening substantive review. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18704(b).) A public official uses his or her official position to influence a governmental decision if he or she contacts or appears before any official in his or her agency or in an agency subject to the authority or budgetary control of his or her agency for the purpose of affecting a decision or any other governmental agency and acts or on behalf of his or her agency in making the contact. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18704(c) )

There are limited exceptions to these rules. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18704(d).

PRACTICE TIP: Because “participation” is broader than merely the final vote on a matter, it is important for public officials to not become involved in the preliminary stages of a decision on which their board or commission may ultimately have the final vote.

If the public official is not “making a decision” as defined in the Political Reform Act, then he or she does not have a conflict of interest.

D. DISQUALIFICATION IF CONFLICT EXISTS

If, after following the process outlined above, a conflict is found to exist, the public official is disqualified from participating in making the decision. An official who is disqualified from an item on the agenda for a closed session may not attend the closed session or obtain the materials distributed for the closed session.

If a conflict exists and the disqualified member is not required to participate by the rule of necessity, then the member must:

1. Publicly identify the financial interest that gives rise to the conflict in detail sufficient for a layperson to understand the conflict.

2. Recuse himself/herself from attempting to influence, participating in, discussing or voting on the matter.

3. Leave the room where the discussion or consideration of the matter is occurring, unless the matter is listed on the consent calendar of the public agency.

Notwithstanding the conflict, however, an official may appear in the same manner as a member of the general public before his or her agency solely to represent himself in a matter related to his or her own personal interests. This includes where decisions would affect real property or a business entity that is solely owned by the official or the official’s immediate family. In such cases, the official must still identify the conflict and leave the dais, but he or she may address the agency from the same position as the public and may listen to the public discussion of the item. (2 CCR § 18704(d).

The public agency may also be able to “segment” the decision under consideration, so that the official may participate in portions, but not all, of the decision. This may occur provided that: (2) the decision can be broken down into separate decisions that are not “inextricably interrelated” to the decision in which the official has a conflict; (2) the decision in which the official has a financial interest is segmented from the other decisions; (3) the decision in which the official has a financial interest is considered first and a final decision on that segment is reached by the agency without any participation by the official; and (4)
participation by the official in the remaining segments does not result in a reopening of, or
otherwise financially affect, the segment from which the official was disqualified. (2 CCR § 18706.)

E. PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF THE POLITICAL REFORM ACT

1. Administrative Fine

The administrative fine is $5,000 fine per violation imposed by FPPC.

2. Civil Remedy

If official derived economic benefit from decision, fine could amount to 3 times the benefit received.

3. Criminal Sanctions

If the official knowingly or willingly violated the law: misdemeanor conviction, fine of $10,000 or 3 times value of benefit conferred (whichever is greater and the official may not be a candidate for public office for 4 years).

F. HOW TO OBTAIN ADVICE

If you think you may have a conflict, contact your agency’s attorney who may be able to provide general guidance. The FPPC will also provide free advice.

1. Unofficial

You may request unofficial advice from the FPPC by calling 1-866-ASK-FPPC (1-866-275-3772), or you can get general guidance and information from the FPPC website at “www.fppc.ca.org.”

2. FPPC Advice Letter

Only a public official or his or her authorized representative can seek advice concerning his/her duties. The FPPC does not provide third party advice. However, written FPPC advice conveys immunity even if the advice is incorrect as long as the advice is followed. The FPPC does not provide advice for past conduct. Importantly, receiving written advice from the FPPC can take up to a month, so requests should be made far in advance of the relevant decision.

PRACTICE TIP: If uncertain regarding the existence of a conflict, always ask for advice first in order to obtain the immunity. Advice may take several months, therefore ask early. If the FPPC is unclear on the facts as described in your request, it may respond with a letter that generally describes the applicable standards, but does not answer the specific question and does not provide immunity.

II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Recent state legislation, Senate Bill 1439, amended Government Code Section 84308 and significantly modified this topic. The City Attorney’s Office is working on an advice memorandum that will be circulated to public officials.
III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WHEN LEAVING OFFICE

Prior to leaving government office or employment, the Political Reform Act prohibits all public officials from making, participating in the making or using their official position to influence the making of government decisions directly relating to any person with whom they are negotiating, or have any arrangement, concerning prospective employment. (Gov. Code § 87407.) This requirement was amended in 2003 to include local government officials as well as State officials.

A local elected official, chief administrative officer of a county, city manager, or general manager or chief administrator of a special district who held a position with a local government agency shall not, for a period of one year after leaving that office or employment, act as agent or attorney for any other person by making any formal or informal appearance before or by making any oral or written communication to that local government agency, or any committee, subcommittee, or present member, officer, or employee of that local government agency, if the appearance or communication is made for the purpose of influencing administrative or legislative action, or influencing any action or proceeding involving the issuance, amendment, awarding, or revocation of a permit, license, grant, or contract, or the sale or purchase of goods or property. (Gov. Code § 87406.3(a).) This prohibition will not apply if the former official is an officer or employee of, and appearing on behalf of, another public agency. (Gov. Code § 87406.3(b).)

IV. PROHIBITION AGAINST BRIBERY

Penal Code Section 165 provides that a member of any city or town council, board of supervisors, or board of trustees of any local public agency who receives, or offers or agrees to receive any bribe upon any understanding that his or her official vote, opinion, judgment, or action shall be influenced thereby, may be imprisoned for up to four years and forever disqualified from holding any public office or trust.

Penal Code Section 7 defines a “bribe” for the purposes of the Penal Code as “anything of value or advantage, present or prospective, or any promise or undertaking to give any, asked, given, or accepted, with a corrupt intent to influence, unlawfully, the person to whom it is given, in his or her action, vote, or opinion, in any public or official capacity.”

As far as the bribe-taker is concerned, the crime of bribery consists of three elements: (1) the person charged must be a member of one of the bodies specified in section 165, which basically consists of all cities, counties, and other local public agencies; (2) that person must ask for, receive, or agree to receive something of “value or advantage,” present or prospective; and (3) the request, receipt or agreement to receive must be upon an understanding that his or her opinion, judgment or action upon any official matter on which he or she may be required to act will be influenced.

PRACTICE TIP: While the common perception of a bribe is a large sum of money passed under the table, the fact is that a bribe can take virtually any form. A public official should be careful not to accept anything of value that might influence his or her official decision.
V. COMMON LAW BIAS PROHIBITIONS

A. COMMON LAW CONFLICT OF INTEREST CASES

While there are now statutory provisions prohibiting a financial conflict of interest, there are still cases that invoke the old common law doctrine against conflicts of interest. The common law doctrine against conflicts of interest is the judicial expression of the public policy against public officials using their official positions for private benefit. This doctrine has been primarily applied to require a public official to abstain from participation in cases where the public official’s private financial interest may conflict with his or her official duties. But it can also apply to non-financial conflicts as well.

By virtue of holding public office, an elected official is impliedly bound to exercise the powers conferred on him or her with disinterested skill, zeal, and diligence and primarily for the benefit of the public. An elected official bears a fiduciary duty to exercise the powers of office for the benefit of the public and is not permitted to use those powers for the benefit of private interest. (See Noble v. City of Palo Alto, 89 Cal.App. 47, 51 (1928).) Violation of the common law duty to avoid conflicts of interest can constitute official misconduct and result in a loss of office. Generally, such conflicts are found only when there is an identifiable financial interest that is affected; however, any potential common law conflict of interest issue should be discussed with your agency’s attorney.
1. PUBLIC COMMENT: The City Council values your comments; however, pursuant to the Brown Act, Council cannot take action on items not listed on the posted agenda. The public comment period is limited to 20 minutes, with 2 minutes allotted for each speaker. This public comment period is to address the City Council on Consent Calendar items, other agenda items (if the member of the public cannot be present at the time the item is considered) or items of genera...
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Chapter 1

IT IS THE PEOPLE’S BUSINESS

The right of access

Two key parts of the Brown Act have not changed since its adoption in 1953. One is the Brown Act’s initial section, declaring the Legislature’s intent:

“In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.”

“The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.”

The people reconfirmed that intent 50 years later in the November 2004 election by adopting Proposition 59, amending the California Constitution to include a public right of access to government information:

“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.”

The Brown Act’s other unchanged provision is a single sentence:

“All meetings of the legislative body of a local agency shall be open and public, and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the legislative body of a local agency, except as otherwise provided in this chapter.”

That one sentence is by far the most important of the entire Brown Act. If the opening is the soul, that sentence is the heart of the Brown Act.

Broad coverage

The Brown Act covers members of virtually every type of local government body, elected or appointed, decision-making or advisory. Some types of private organizations are covered, as are newly-elected members of a legislative body, even before they take office.

Similarly, meetings subject to the Brown Act are not limited to face-to-face gatherings. They also include any communication medium or device through which a majority of a legislative body

PRACTICE TIP: The key to the Brown Act is a single sentence. In summary, all meetings shall be open and public except when the Brown Act authorizes otherwise.
discusses, deliberates or takes action on an item of business outside of a noticed meeting. They include meetings held from remote locations by teleconference.

New communication technologies present new Brown Act challenges. For example, common email practices of forwarding or replying to messages can easily lead to a serial meeting prohibited by the Brown Act, as can participation by members of a legislative body in an internet chatroom or blog dialogue. Communicating during meetings using electronic technology (such as laptop computers, tablets, or smart phones) may create the perception that private communications are influencing the outcome of decisions; some state legislatures have banned the practice. On the other hand, widespread cablecasting and web streaming of meetings has greatly expanded public access to the decision-making process.

Narrow exemptions
The express purpose of the Brown Act is to assure that local government agencies conduct the public’s business openly and publicly. Courts and the California Attorney General usually broadly construe the Brown Act in favor of greater public access and narrowly construe exemptions to its general rules.  

Generally, public officials should think of themselves as living in glass houses, and that they may only draw the curtains when it is in the public interest to preserve confidentiality. Closed sessions may be held only as specifically authorized by the provisions of the Brown Act itself.

The Brown Act, however, is limited to meetings among a majority of the members of multi-member government bodies when the subject relates to local agency business. It does not apply to independent conduct of individual decision-makers. It does not apply to social, ceremonial, educational, and other gatherings as long as a majority of the members of a body do not discuss issues related to their local agency’s business. Meetings of temporary advisory committees — as distinguished from standing committees — made up solely of less than a quorum of a legislative body are not subject to the Brown Act.

The law does not apply to local agency staff or employees, but they may facilitate a violation by acting as a conduit for discussion, deliberation, or action by the legislative body.

The law, on the one hand, recognizes the need of individual local officials to meet and discuss matters with their constituents. On the other hand, it requires — with certain specific exceptions to protect the community and preserve individual rights — that the decision-making process be public. Sometimes the boundary between the two is not easy to draw.

Public participation in meetings
In addition to requiring the public’s business to be conducted in open, noticed meetings, the Brown Act also extends to the public the right to participate in meetings. Individuals, lobbyists, and members of the news media possess the right to attend, record, broadcast, and participate in public meetings. The public’s participation is further enhanced by the Brown Act’s requirement that a meaningful agenda be posted in advance of meetings, by limiting discussion and action to matters listed on the agenda, and by requiring that meeting materials be made available.

Legislative bodies may, however, adopt reasonable regulations on public testimony and the conduct of public meetings, including measures to address disruptive conduct and irrelevant speech.
Controversy
Not surprisingly, the Brown Act has been a source of confusion and controversy since its inception. News media and government watchdogs often argue the law is toothless, pointing out that there has never been a single criminal conviction for a violation. They often suspect that closed sessions are being misused.

Public officials complain that the Brown Act makes it difficult to respond to constituents and requires public discussions of items better discussed privately — such as why a particular person should not be appointed to a board or commission. Many elected officials find the Brown Act inconsistent with their private business experiences. Closed meetings can be more efficient; they eliminate grandstanding and promote candor. The techniques that serve well in business — the working lunch, the sharing of information through a series of phone calls or emails, the backroom conversations and compromises — are often not possible under the Brown Act.

As a matter of public policy, California (along with many other states) has concluded that there is more to be gained than lost by conducting public business in the open. Government behind closed doors may well be efficient and business-like, but it may be perceived as unresponsive and untrustworthy.

Beyond the law — good business practices
Violations of the Brown Act can lead to invalidation of an agency’s action, payment of a challenger’s attorney fees, public embarrassment, even criminal prosecution. But the Brown Act is a floor, not a ceiling for conduct of public officials. This guide is focused not only on the Brown Act as a minimum standard, but also on meeting practices or activities that, legal or not, are likely to create controversy. Problems may crop up, for example, when agenda descriptions are too brief or vague, when an informal get-together takes on the appearance of a meeting, when an agency conducts too much of its business in closed session or discusses matters in closed session that are beyond the authorized scope, or when controversial issues arise that are not on the agenda.

The Brown Act allows a legislative body to adopt practices and requirements for greater access to meetings for itself and its subordinate committees and bodies that are more stringent than the law itself requires. Rather than simply restate the basic requirements of the Brown Act, local open meeting policies should strive to anticipate and prevent problems in areas where the Brown Act does not provide full guidance. As with the adoption of any other significant policy, public comment should be solicited.

A local policy could build on these basic Brown Act goals:

- A legislative body’s need to get its business done smoothly;
- The public’s right to participate meaningfully in meetings, and to review documents used in decision-making at a relevant point in time;
- A local agency’s right to confidentially address certain negotiations, personnel matters, claims and litigation; and
- The right of the press to fully understand and communicate public agency decision-making.
An explicit and comprehensive public meeting and information policy, especially if reviewed periodically, can be an important element in maintaining or improving public relations. Such a policy exceeds the absolute requirements of the law — but if the law were enough, this guide would be unnecessary. A narrow legalistic approach will not avoid or resolve potential controversies. An agency should consider going beyond the law, and look at its unique circumstances and determine if there is a better way to prevent potential problems and promote public trust. At the very least, local agencies need to think about how their agendas are structured in order to make Brown Act compliance easier. They need to plan carefully to make sure public participation fits smoothly into the process.

Achieving balance

The Brown Act should be neither an excuse for hiding the ball nor a mechanism for hindering efficient and orderly meetings. The Brown Act represents a balance among the interests of constituencies whose interests do not always coincide. It calls for openness in local government, yet should allow government to function responsively and productively.

There must be both adequate notice of what discussion and action is to occur during a meeting as well as a normal degree of spontaneity in the dialogue between elected officials and their constituents.

The ability of an elected official to confer with constituents or colleagues must be balanced against the important public policy prohibiting decision-making outside of public meetings.

In the end, implementation of the Brown Act must ensure full participation of the public and preserve the integrity of the decision-making process, yet not stifle government officials and impede the effective and natural operation of government.

Historical note

In late 1951, San Francisco Chronicle reporter Mike Harris spent six weeks looking into the way local agencies conducted meetings. State law had long required that business be done in public, but Harris discovered secret meetings or caucuses were common. He wrote a 10-part series on “Your Secret Government” that ran in May and June 1952.

Out of the series came a decision to push for a new state open meeting law. Harris and Richard (Bud) Carpenter, legal counsel for the League of California Cities, drafted such a bill and Assembly Member Ralph M. Brown agreed to carry it. The Legislature passed the bill and Governor Earl Warren signed it into law in 1953.

The Ralph M. Brown Act, known as the Brown Act, has evolved under a series of amendments and court decisions, and has been the model for other open meeting laws — such as the Bagley-Keene Act, enacted in 1967 to cover state agencies.

Assembly Member Brown is best known for the open meeting law that carries his name. He was elected to the Assembly in 1942 and served 19 years, including the last three years as Speaker. He then became an appellate court justice.
ENDNOTES:
1 California Government Code section 54950
2 California Constitution, Art. 1, section 3(b)(1)
3 California Government Code section 54953(a)
4 This principle of broad construction when it furthers public access and narrow construction if a provision limits public access is also stated in the amendment to the State’s Constitution adopted by Proposition 59 in 2004. California Constitution, Art. 1, section 3(b)(2).
5 California Government Code section 54952.2(b)(2) and (c)(1); Wolfe v. City of Fremont (2006) 144 Cal.App.4th 533
6 California Government Code section 54953.7

Updates to this publication responding to changes in the Brown Act or new court interpretations are available at www.cacities.org/opengovernment. A current version of the Brown Act may be found at www.leginfo.ca.gov.
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Chapter 2
LEGISLATIVE BODIES

The Brown Act applies to the legislative bodies of local agencies. It defines “legislative body” broadly to include just about every type of decision-making body of a local agency.1

What is a “legislative body” of a local agency?
A “legislative body” includes:

- The “governing body” of a local agency and certain of its subsidiary bodies; “or any other local body created by state or federal statute.”2 This includes city councils, boards of supervisors, school boards and boards of trustees of special districts. A “local agency” is any city, county, city and county, school district, municipal corporation, successor agency to a redevelopment agency, district, political subdivision or other local public agency.3 A housing authority is a local agency under the Brown Act even though it is created by and is an agent of the state.4 The California Attorney General has opined that air pollution control districts and regional open space districts are also covered.5 Entities created pursuant to joint powers agreements are also local agencies within the meaning of the Brown Act.6

- Newly-elected members of a legislative body who have not yet assumed office must conform to the requirements of the Brown Act as if already in office.7 Thus, meetings between incumbents and newly-elected members of a legislative body, such as a meeting between two outgoing members and a member-elect of a five-member body, could violate the Brown Act.

Q. On the morning following the election to a five-member legislative body of a local agency, two successful candidates, neither an incumbent, meet with an incumbent member of the legislative body for a celebratory breakfast. Does this violate the Brown Act?

A. It might, and absolutely would if the conversation turns to agency business. Even though the candidates-elect have not officially been sworn in, the Brown Act applies. If purely a social event, there is no violation but it would be preferable if others were invited to attend to avoid the appearance of impropriety.

- Appointed bodies — whether permanent or temporary, decision-making or advisory — including planning commissions, civil service commissions and other subsidiary committees, boards, and bodies. Volunteer groups, executive search committees, task forces, and blue ribbon committees created by formal action of the governing body are legislative bodies. When the members of two or more legislative bodies are appointed to serve on an entirely separate advisory group, the resulting body may be subject to the
Brown Act. In one reported case, a city council created a committee of two members of the city council and two members of the city planning commission to review qualifications of prospective planning commissioners and make recommendations to the council. The court held that their joint mission made them a legislative body subject to the Brown Act. Had the two committees remained separate; and met only to exchange information and report back to their respective boards, they would have been exempt from the Brown Act.

- **Standing committees** of a legislative body, irrespective of their composition, which have either: (1) a continuing subject matter jurisdiction; or (2) a meeting schedule fixed by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body. Even if it comprises less than a quorum of the governing body, a standing committee is subject to the Brown Act. For example, if a governing body creates long-term committees on budget and finance or on public safety, those are standing committees subject to the Brown Act. Further, according to the California Attorney General, function over form controls. For example, a statement by the legislative body that the advisory committee “shall not exercise continuing subject matter jurisdiction” or the fact that the committee does not have a fixed meeting schedule is not determinative. “Formal action” by a legislative body includes authorization given to the agency’s executive officer to appoint an advisory committee pursuant to agency-adopted policy.

- The governing body of any **private organization** either: (1) created by the legislative body in order to exercise authority that may lawfully be delegated by such body to a private corporation, limited liability company or other entity; or (2) that receives agency funding and whose governing board includes a member of the legislative body of the local agency appointed by the legislative body as a full voting member of the private entity’s governing board. These include some nonprofit corporations created by local agencies. If a local agency contracts with a private firm for a service (for example, payroll, janitorial, or food services), the private firm is not covered by the Brown Act. When a member of a legislative body sits on a board of a private organization as a private person and is not appointed by the legislative body, the board will not be subject to the Brown Act. Similarly, when the legislative body appoints someone other than one of its own members to such boards, the Brown Act does not apply. Nor does it apply when a private organization merely receives agency funding.

---

**PRACTICE TIP:** It can be difficult to determine whether a subcommittee of a body falls into the category of a standing committee or an exempt temporary committee. Suppose a committee is created to explore the renewal of a franchise or a topic of similarly limited scope and duration. Is it an exempt temporary committee or a non-exempt standing committee? The answer may depend on factors such as how meeting schedules are determined, the scope of the committee’s charge, or whether the committee exists long enough to have “continuing jurisdiction.”

---

**Q:** The local chamber of commerce is funded in part by the city. The mayor sits on the chamber’s board of directors. Is the chamber board a legislative body subject to the Brown Act?

**A:** Maybe. If the chamber’s governing documents require the mayor to be on the board and the city council appoints the mayor to that position, the board is a legislative body. If, however, the chamber board independently appoints the mayor to its board, or the mayor attends chamber board meetings in a purely advisory capacity, it is not.

**Q:** If a community college district board creates an auxiliary organization to operate a campus bookstore or cafeteria, is the board of the organization a legislative body?

**A:** Yes. But, if the district instead contracts with a private firm to operate the bookstore or cafeteria, the Brown Act would not apply to the private firm.

- **Certain types of hospital operators.** A lessee of a hospital (or portion of a hospital)
first leased under Health and Safety Code subsection 32121(p) after January 1, 1994, which
exercises “material authority” delegated to it by a local agency, whether or not such lessee
is organized and operated by the agency or by a delegated authority.16

What is not a “legislative body” for purposes of the Brown Act?

- A temporary advisory committee composed solely of less than a quorum of the
  legislative body that serves a limited or single purpose, that is not perpetual, and that
  will be dissolved once its specific task is completed is not subject to the Brown Act.17
  Temporary committees are sometimes called ad hoc committees, a term not used in the
  Brown Act. Examples include an advisory committee composed of less than a quorum
  created to interview candidates for a vacant position or to meet with representatives of
  other entities to exchange information on a matter of concern to the agency, such as traffic
  congestion.18
- Groups advisory to a single decision-maker or appointed by staff are not covered. The
  Brown Act applies only to committees created by formal action of the legislative body and
  not to committees created by others. A committee advising a superintendent of schools
  would not be covered by the Brown Act. However, the same committee, if created by
  formal action of the school board, would be covered.19

Q. A member of the legislative body of a local agency informally establishes an
advisory committee of five residents to advise her on issues as they arise. Does
the Brown Act apply to this committee?

A. No, because the committee has not been established by formal action of the
legislative body.

Q. During a meeting of the city council, the council directs the city manager to form
an advisory committee of residents to develop recommendations for a new
ordinance. The city manager forms the committee and appoints its members; the
committee is instructed to direct its recommendations to the city manager. Does
the Brown Act apply to this committee?

A. Possibly, because the direction from the city council might be regarded as a formal
action of the body notwithstanding that the city manager controls the committee.

- Individual decision makers who are not elected or appointed members of a legislative body
  are not covered by the Brown Act. For example, a disciplinary hearing presided over by a
department head or a meeting of agency department heads are not subject to the Brown
Act since such assemblies are not those of a legislative body.20
- Public employees, each acting individually and not engaging in collective deliberation
  on a specific issue, such as the drafting and review of an agreement, do not constitute
  a legislative body under the Brown Act, even if the drafting and review process was
  established by a legislative body.21
- County central committees of political parties are also not Brown Act bodies.22

ENDNOTES:

1 Taxpayers for Livable Communities v. City of Malibu (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 1123, 1127
California Government Code section 54952(a) and (b)

California Government Code section 54951; Health and Safety Code section 34173(g) (successor agencies to former redevelopment agencies subject to the Brown Act). But see Education Code section 35147, which exempts certain school councils and school site advisory committees from the Brown Act and imposes upon them a separate set of rules.

Torres v. Board of Commissioners of Housing Authority of Tulare County (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 545, 549-550


California Government Code section 54952.1


California Government Code section 54952(b)


California Government Code section 54952(c)(1). Regarding private organizations that receive local agency funding, the same rule applies to a full voting member appointed prior to February 9, 1996 who, after that date, is made a non-voting board member by the legislative body. California Government Code section 54952(c)(2)


California Government Code section 54952(d)

California Government Code section 54952(b); see also Freedom Newspapers, Inc. v. Orange County Employees Retirement System Board of Directors (1993) 6 Cal.4th 821, 832.


Updates to this publication responding to changes in the Brown Act or new court interpretations are available at www.cacities.org/opengovernment. A current version of the Brown Act may be found at www.leginfo.ca.gov.
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Chapter 3

MEETINGS

The Brown Act only applies to meetings of local legislative bodies. The Brown Act defines a meeting as: “… and any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body at the same time and location, including teleconference location as permitted by Section 54953, to hear, discuss, deliberate, or take any action on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.”¹ The term “meeting” is not limited to gatherings at which action is taken but includes deliberative gatherings as well. A hearing before an individual hearing officer is not a meeting under the Brown Act because it is not a hearing before a legislative body.²

Brown Act meetings

Brown Act meetings include a legislative body’s regular meetings, special meetings, emergency meetings, and adjourned meetings.

- **“Regular meetings”** are meetings occurring at the dates, times, and location set by resolution, ordinance, or other formal action by the legislative body and are subject to 72-hour posting requirements.³
- **“Special meetings”** are meetings called by the presiding officer or majority of the legislative body to discuss only discrete items on the agenda under the Brown Act’s notice requirements for special meetings and are subject to 24-hour posting requirements.⁴
- **“Emergency meetings”** are a limited class of meetings held when prompt action is needed due to actual or threatened disruption of public facilities and are held on little notice.⁵
- **“Adjourned meetings”** are regular or special meetings that have been adjourned or re-adjourned to a time and place specified in the order of adjournment, with no agenda required for regular meetings adjourned for less than five calendar days as long as no additional business is transacted.⁶

Six exceptions to the meeting definition

The Brown Act creates six exceptions to the meeting definition:⁷

**Individual Contacts**

The first exception involves individual contacts between a member of the legislative body and any other person. The Brown Act does not limit a legislative body member acting on his or her own. This exception recognizes the right to confer with constituents, advocates, consultants, news reporters, local agency staff, or a colleague.

Individual contacts, however, cannot be used to do in stages what would be prohibited in one step. For example, a series of individual contacts that leads to discussion, deliberation, or action among a majority of the members of a legislative body is prohibited. Such serial meetings are discussed below.
Conferences

The second exception allows a legislative body majority to attend a conference or similar gathering open to the public that addresses issues of general interest to the public or to public agencies of the type represented by the legislative body.

Among other things, this exception permits legislative body members to attend annual association conferences of city, county, school, community college, and other local agency officials, so long as those meetings are open to the public. However, a majority of members cannot discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled program, business of a specific nature that is within their local agency’s subject matter jurisdiction.

Community Meetings

The third exception allows a legislative body majority to attend an open and publicized meeting held by another organization to address a topic of local community concern. A majority cannot discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled program, business of a specific nature that is within the legislative body’s subject matter jurisdiction. Under this exception, a legislative body majority may attend a local service club meeting or a local candidates’ night if the meetings are open to the public.

“I see we have four distinguished members of the city council at our meeting tonight,” said the chair of the Environmental Action Coalition. “I wonder if they have anything to say about the controversy over enacting a slow growth ordinance?”

The Brown Act permits a majority of a legislative body to attend and speak at an open and publicized meeting conducted by another organization. The Brown Act may nevertheless be violated if a majority discusses, deliberates, or takes action on an item during the meeting of the other organization. There is a fine line between what is permitted and what is not; hence, members should exercise caution when participating in these types of events.

Q. The local chamber of commerce sponsors an open and public candidate debate during an election campaign. Three of the five agency members are up for re-election and all three participate. All of the candidates are asked their views of a controversial project scheduled for a meeting to occur just after the election. May the three incumbents answer the question?

A. Yes, because the Brown Act does not constrain the incumbents from expressing their views regarding important matters facing the local agency as part of the political process the same as any other candidates.
Other Legislative Bodies

The fourth exception allows a majority of a legislative body to attend an open and publicized meeting of: (1) another body of the local agency; and (2) a legislative body of another local agency. Again, the majority cannot discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled meeting, business of a specific nature that is within their subject matter jurisdiction. This exception allows, for example, a city council or a majority of a board of supervisors to attend a controversial meeting of the planning commission.

Nothing in the Brown Act prevents the majority of a legislative body from sitting together at such a meeting. They may choose not to, however, to preclude any possibility of improperly discussing local agency business and to avoid the appearance of a Brown Act violation. Further, aside from the Brown Act, there may be other reasons, such as due process considerations, why the members should avoid giving public testimony or trying to influence the outcome of proceedings before a subordinate body.

Q. The entire legislative body intends to testify against a bill before the Senate Local Government Committee in Sacramento. Must this activity be noticed as a meeting of the body?
A. No, because the members are attending and participating in an open meeting of another governmental body which the public may attend.

Q. The members then proceed upstairs to the office of their local Assembly member to discuss issues of local interest. Must this session be noticed as a meeting and be open to the public?
A. Yes, because the entire body may not meet behind closed doors except for proper closed sessions. The same answer applies to a private lunch or dinner with the Assembly member.

Standing Committees

The fifth exception authorizes the attendance of a majority at an open and noticed meeting of a standing committee of the legislative body, provided that the legislative body members who are not members of the standing committee attend only as observers (meaning that they cannot speak or otherwise participate in the meeting).

Q. The legislative body establishes a standing committee of two of its five members, which meets monthly. A third member of the legislative body wants to attend these meetings and participate. May she?
A. She may attend, but only as an observer; she may not participate.
Social or Ceremonial Events
The final exception permits a majority of a legislative body to attend a purely social or ceremonial occasion. Once again, a majority cannot discuss business among themselves of a specific nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.

Nothing in the Brown Act prevents a majority of members from attending the same football game, party, wedding, funeral, reception, or farewell. The test is not whether a majority of a legislative body attends the function, but whether business of a specific nature within the subject matter jurisdiction of the body is discussed. So long as no such business is discussed, there is no violation of the Brown Act.

Grand Jury Testimony
In addition, members of a legislative body, either individually or collectively, may give testimony in private before a grand jury. This is the equivalent of a seventh exception to the Brown Act’s definition of a “meeting.”

Collective briefings
None of these exceptions permits a majority of a legislative body to meet together with staff in advance of a meeting for a collective briefing. Any such briefings that involve a majority of the body in the same place and time must be open to the public and satisfy Brown Act meeting notice and agenda requirements.

Retreats or workshops of legislative bodies
Gatherings by a majority of legislative body members at the legislative body’s retreats, study sessions, or workshops are covered under the Brown Act. This is the case whether the retreat, study session, or workshop focuses on long-range agency planning, discussion of critical local issues, or team building and group dynamics.

Q. The legislative body wants to hold a team-building session to improve relations among its members. May such a session be conducted behind closed doors?
A. No, this is not a proper subject for a closed session, and there is no other basis to exclude the public. Council relations are a matter of public business.

Serial meetings
One of the most frequently asked questions about the Brown Act involves serial meetings. At any one time, such meetings involve only a portion of a legislative body, but eventually involve a majority. The Brown Act provides that “[a] majority of the members of a legislative body shall not, outside a meeting … use a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.” The problem with serial meetings is the process, which deprives the public of an opportunity for meaningful observation of and participation in legislative body decision-making.
The serial meeting may occur by either a “daisy chain” or a “hub and spoke” sequence. In the daisy chain scenario, Member A contacts Member B, Member B contacts Member C, Member C contacts Member D and so on, until a quorum has discussed, deliberated, or taken action on an item within the legislative body’s subject matter jurisdiction. The hub and spoke process involves at least two scenarios. In the first scenario, Member A (the hub) sequentially contacts Members B, C, and D and so on (the spokes), until a quorum has been contacted. In the second scenario, a staff member (the hub), functioning as an intermediary for the legislative body or one of its members, communicates with a majority of members (the spokes) one-by-one for discussion, deliberation, or a decision on a proposed action. Another example of a serial meeting is when a chief executive officer (the hub) briefs a majority of members (the spokes) prior to a formal meeting and, in the process, information about the members’ respective views is revealed. Each of these scenarios violates the Brown Act.

A legislative body member has the right, if not the duty, to meet with constituents to address their concerns. That member also has the right to confer with a colleague (but not with a majority of the body, counting the member) or appropriate staff about local agency business. An employee or official of a local agency may engage in separate conversations or communications outside of an open and noticed meeting “with members of a legislative body in order to answer questions or provide information regarding a matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency if that person does not communicate to members of the legislative body the comments or position of any other member or members of the legislative body.”

The Brown Act has been violated, however, if several one-on-one meetings or conferences leads to a discussion, deliberation, or action by a majority. In one case, a violation occurred when a quorum of a city council, by a letter that had been circulated among members outside of a formal meeting, directed staff to take action in an eminent domain proceeding.

A unilateral written communication to the legislative body, such as an informational or advisory memorandum, does not violate the Brown Act. Such a memo, however, may be a public record. The phone call was from a lobbyist. “Say, I need your vote for that project in the south area. How about it?”

“Well, I don’t know,” replied Board Member Aletto. “That’s kind of a sticky proposition. You sure you need my vote?”

“Well, I’ve got Bradley and Cohen lined up and another vote leaning. With you I’d be over the top.”

Moments later, the phone rings again. “Hey, I’ve been hearing some rumbles on that south area project,” said the newspaper reporter. “I’m counting noses. How are you voting on it?”

Neither the lobbyist nor the reporter has violated the Brown Act, but they are facilitating...
The board member may have violated the Brown Act by hearing about the positions of other board members and indeed coaxing the lobbyist to reveal the other board members’ positions by asking “You sure you need my vote?” The prudent course is to avoid such leading conversations and to caution lobbyists, staff, and news media against revealing such positions of others.

The mayor sat down across from the city manager. “From now on,” he declared, “I want you to provide individual briefings on upcoming agenda items. Some of this material is very technical, and the council members don’t want to sound like idiots asking about it in public. Besides that, briefings will speed up the meeting.”

Agency employees or officials may have separate conversations or communications outside of an open and noticed meeting “with members of a legislative body in order to answer questions or provide information regarding a matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency if that person does not communicate to members of the legislative body the comments or position of any other member or members of the legislative body.” Members should always be vigilant when discussing local agency business with anyone to avoid conversations that could lead to a discussion, deliberation or action taken among the majority of the legislative body.

“Thanks for the information,” said Council Member Kim. “These zoning changes can be tricky, and now I think I’m better equipped to make the right decision.”

“Glad to be of assistance,” replied the planning director. “I’m sure Council Member Jones is OK with these changes. How are you leaning?”

“Well,” said Council Member Kim, “I’m leaning toward approval. I know that two of my colleagues definitely favor approval.”

The planning director should not disclose Jones’ prospective vote, and Kim should not disclose the prospective votes of two of her colleagues. Under these facts, there likely has been a serial meeting in violation of the Brown Act.

**Q.** The agency’s website includes a chat room where agency employees and officials participate anonymously and often discuss issues of local agency business. Members of the legislative body participate regularly. Does this scenario present a potential for violation of the Brown Act?

**A.** Yes, because it is a technological device that may serve to allow for a majority of members to discuss, deliberate, or take action on matters of agency business.

**Q.** A member of a legislative body contacts two other members on a five-member body relative to scheduling a special meeting. Is this an illegal serial meeting?

**A.** No, the Brown Act expressly allows a majority of a body to call a special meeting, though the members should avoid discussing the merits of what is to be taken up at the meeting.
Particular care should be exercised when staff briefings of legislative body members occur by email because of the ease of using the “reply to all” button that may inadvertently result in a Brown Act violation.

**Informal gatherings**

Often members are tempted to mix business with pleasure — for example, by holding a post-meeting gathering. Informal gatherings at which local agency business is discussed or transacted violate the law if they are not conducted in conformance with the Brown Act. A luncheon gathering in a crowded dining room violates the Brown Act if the public does not have an opportunity to attend, hear, or participate in the deliberations of members.

Thursday at 11:30 a.m., as they did every week, the board of directors of the Dry Gulch Irrigation District trooped into Pop’s Donut Shoppe for an hour of talk and fellowship. They sat at the corner window, fronting on Main and Broadway, to show they had nothing to hide. Whenever he could, the managing editor of the weekly newspaper down the street hurried over to join the board.

A gathering like this would not violate the Brown Act if board members scrupulously avoided talking about irrigation district issues — which might be difficult. This kind of situation should be avoided. The public is unlikely to believe the board members could meet regularly without discussing public business. A newspaper executive’s presence in no way lessens the potential for a violation of the Brown Act.

**Q.** The agency has won a major victory in the Supreme Court on an issue of importance. The presiding officer decides to hold an impromptu press conference in order to make a statement to the print and broadcast media. All the other members show up in order to make statements of their own and be seen by the media. Is this gathering illegal?

**A.** Technically there is no exception for this sort of gathering, but as long as members do not state their intentions as to future action to be taken and the press conference is open to the public, it seems harmless.

**Technological conferencing**

Except for certain nonsubstantive purposes, such as scheduling a special meeting, a conference call including a majority of the members of a legislative body is an unlawful meeting. But, in an effort to keep up with information age technologies, the Brown Act specifically allows a legislative body to use any type of teleconferencing to meet, receive public comment and testimony, deliberate, or conduct a closed session. While the Brown Act contains specific requirements for conducting a teleconference, the decision to use teleconferencing is entirely discretionary with the body. No person has a right under the Brown Act to have a meeting by teleconference.

“Teleconference” is defined as “a meeting of a legislative body, the members of which are in different locations, connected by electronic means, through either
audio or video, or both.

In addition to the specific requirements relating to teleconferencing, the meeting must comply with all provisions of the Brown Act otherwise applicable. The Brown Act contains the following teleconferencing requirements:

- Teleconferencing may be used for all purposes during any meeting;
- At least a quorum of the legislative body must participate from locations within the local agency's jurisdiction;
- Additional teleconference locations may be made available for the public;
- Each teleconference location must be specifically identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting, including a full address and room number, as may be applicable;
- Agendas must be posted at each teleconference location, even if a hotel room or a residence;
- Each teleconference location, including a hotel room or residence, must be accessible to the public and have technology, such as a speakerphone, to enable the public to participate;
- The agenda must provide the opportunity for the public to address the legislative body directly at each teleconference location; and
- All votes must be by roll call.

Q. A member on vacation wants to participate in a meeting of the legislative body and vote by cellular phone from her car while driving from Washington, D.C. to New York. May she?

A. She may not participate or vote because she is not in a noticed and posted teleconference location.

The use of teleconferencing to conduct a legislative body meeting presents a variety of issues beyond the scope of this guide to discuss in detail. Therefore, before teleconferencing a meeting, legal counsel for the local agency should be consulted.

Location of meetings

The Brown Act generally requires all regular and special meetings of a legislative body, including retreats and workshops, to be held within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction.

An open and publicized meeting of a legislative body may be held outside of agency boundaries if the purpose of the meeting is one of the following:

- Comply with state or federal law or a court order, or attend a judicial conference or administrative proceeding in which the local agency is a party;
- Inspect real or personal property that cannot be conveniently brought into the local agency's territory, provided the meeting is limited to items relating to that real or personal property;

Q. The agency is considering approving a major retail mall. The developer has built other similar malls, and invites the entire legislative body to visit a mall outside the jurisdiction. May the entire body go?

A. Yes, the Brown Act permits meetings outside the boundaries of the agency for specified reasons and inspection of property is one such reason. The field trip must be treated as a meeting and the public must be allowed to attend.
- Participate in multiagency meetings or discussions; however, such meetings must be held within the boundaries of one of the participating agencies, and all of those agencies must give proper notice;

- Meet in the closest meeting facility if the local agency has no meeting facility within its boundaries, or meet at its principal office if that office is located outside the territory over which the agency has jurisdiction;

- Meet with elected or appointed federal or California officials when a local meeting would be impractical, solely to discuss a legislative or regulatory issue affecting the local agency and over which the federal or state officials have jurisdiction;

- Meet in or nearby a facility owned by the agency, provided that the topic of the meeting is limited to items directly related to the facility; or

- Visit the office of its legal counsel for a closed session on pending litigation, when to do so would reduce legal fees or costs.25

In addition, the governing board of a school or community college district may hold meetings outside of its boundaries to attend a conference on nonadversarial collective bargaining techniques, interview candidates for school district superintendent, or interview a potential employee from another district.26 A school board may also interview members of the public residing in another district if the board is considering employing that district’s superintendent.

Similarly, meetings of a joint powers authority can occur within the territory of at least one of its member agencies, and a joint powers authority with members throughout the state may meet anywhere in the state.27

Finally, if a fire, flood, earthquake, or other emergency makes the usual meeting place unsafe, the presiding officer can designate another meeting place for the duration of the emergency. News media that have requested notice of meetings must be notified of the designation by the most rapid means of communication available.28
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Effective notice is essential for an open and public meeting. Whether a meeting is open or how the public may participate in that meeting is academic if nobody knows about the meeting.

**Agendas for regular meetings**

Every regular meeting of a legislative body of a local agency — including advisory committees, commissions, or boards, as well as standing committees of legislative bodies — must be preceded by a posted agenda that advises the public of the meeting and the matters to be transacted or discussed.

The agenda must be posted at least 72 hours before the regular meeting in a location “freely accessible to members of the public.” The courts have not definitively interpreted the “freely accessible” requirement. The California Attorney General has interpreted this provision to require posting in a location accessible to the public 24 hours a day during the 72-hour period, but any of the 72 hours may fall on a weekend. This provision may be satisfied by posting on a touch screen electronic kiosk accessible without charge to the public 24 hours a day during the 72-hour period. While posting an agenda on an agency’s Internet website will not, by itself, satisfy the “freely accessible” requirement since there is no universal access to the internet, an agency has a supplemental obligation to post the agenda on its website if: (1) the local agency has a website; and (2) the legislative body whose meeting is the subject of the agenda is either (a) a governing body, or (b) has members that are compensated, with one or more members that are also members of a governing body.

**Q.** May the meeting of a governing body go forward if its agenda was either inadvertently not posted on the city’s website or if the website was not operational during part or all of the 72-hour period preceding the meeting?

**A.** At a minimum, the Brown Act calls for “substantial compliance” with all agenda posting requirements, including posting to the agency website. Should website technical difficulties arise, seek a legal opinion from your agency attorney. The California Attorney General has opined that technical difficulties which cause the website agenda to become inaccessible for a portion of the 72 hours preceding a meeting do not automatically or inevitably lead to a Brown Act violation, provided the agency can demonstrate substantial compliance. This inquiry requires a fact-specific examination of whether the agency or its legislative body made “reasonably effective efforts to notify interested persons of a public meeting” through online posting and other available means. The Attorney General’s opinion suggests that this examination would include an evaluation of how long a technical problem persisted, the efforts made to correct the problem or otherwise ensure that the public was informed, and the actual effect the problem had on public
The agenda must state the meeting time and place and must contain “a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting, including items to be discussed in closed session.” Special care should be taken to describe on the agenda each distinct action to be taken by the legislative body, and avoid overbroad descriptions of a “project” if the “project” is actually a set of distinct actions that must each be separately listed on the agenda.10

Q. The agenda for a regular meeting contains the following items of business:
   • Consideration of a report regarding traffic on Eighth Street; and
   • Consideration of contract with ABC Consulting.
   Are these descriptions adequate?

A. If the first is, it is barely adequate. A better description would provide the reader with some idea of what the report is about and what is being recommended. The second is not adequate. A better description might read “consideration of a contract with ABC Consulting in the amount of $50,000 for traffic engineering services regarding traffic on Eighth Street.”

Q. The agenda includes an item entitled City Manager’s Report, during which time the city manager provides a brief report on notable topics of interest, none of which are listed on the agenda.
   Is this permissible?

A. Yes, so long as it does not result in extended discussion or action by the body.
Notice requirements for special meetings

There is no express agenda requirement for special meetings, but the notice of the special meeting effectively serves as the agenda and limits the business that may be transacted or discussed. Written notice must be sent to each member of the legislative body (unless waived in writing by that member) and to each local newspaper of general circulation, and radio or television station that has requested such notice in writing. This notice must be delivered by personal delivery or any other means that ensures receipt, at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting.

The notice must state the time and place of the meeting, as well as all business to be transacted or discussed. It is recommended that the business to be transacted or discussed be described in the same manner that an item for a regular meeting would be described on the agenda — with a brief general description. As noted above, closed session items should be described in accordance with the Brown Act’s safe harbor provisions to protect legislative bodies and elected officials from challenges of noncompliance with notice requirements.

The special meeting notice must also be posted at least 24 hours prior to the special meeting using the same methods as posting an agenda for a regular meeting: (1) at a site that is freely accessible to the public, and (2) on the agency’s website if: (1) the local agency has a website; and (2) the legislative body whose meeting is the subject of the agenda is either (a) a governing body, or (b) has members that are compensated, with one or more members that are also members of a governing body.12

Notices and agendas for adjourned and continued meetings and hearings

A regular or special meeting can be adjourned and re-adjourned to a time and place specified in the order of adjournment.13 If no time is stated, the meeting is continued to the hour for regular meetings. Whoever is present (even if they are less than a quorum) may so adjourn a meeting; if no member of the legislative body is present, the clerk or secretary may adjourn the meeting. If a meeting is adjourned for less than five calendar days, no new agenda need be posted so long as a new item of business is not introduced.14 A copy of the order of adjournment must be posted within 24 hours after the adjournment, at or near the door of the place where the meeting was held.

A hearing can be continued to a subsequent meeting. The process is the same as for continuing adjourned meetings, except that if the hearing is continued to a time less than 24 hours away, a copy of the order or notice of continuance must be posted immediately following the meeting.15

Notice requirements for emergency meetings

The special meeting notice provisions apply to emergency meetings, except for the 24-hour notice.16 News media that have requested written notice of special meetings must be notified by telephone at least one hour in advance of an emergency meeting, and all telephone numbers provided in that written request must be tried. If telephones are not working, the notice requirements are deemed waived. However, the news media must be notified as soon as possible of the meeting and any action taken.
News media may make a practice of having written requests on file for notification of special or emergency meetings. Absent such a request, a local agency has no legal obligation to notify news media of special or emergency meetings — although notification may be advisable in any event to avoid controversy.

**Notice of compensation for simultaneous or serial meetings**

A legislative body that has convened a meeting and whose membership constitutes a quorum of another legislative body, may convene a simultaneous or serial meeting of the other legislative body only after a clerk or member of the convened legislative body orally announces: (1) the amount of compensation or stipend, if any, that each member will be entitled to receive as a result of convening the meeting of the other legislative body; and (2) that the compensation or stipend is provided as a result of convening the meeting of that body.

No oral disclosure of the amount of the compensation is required if the entire amount of such compensation is prescribed by statute and no additional compensation has been authorized by the local agency. Further, no disclosure is required with respect to reimbursements for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the member’s official duties, such as for travel, meals, and lodging.

**Educational agency meetings**

The Education Code contains some special agenda and special meeting provisions. However, they are generally consistent with the Brown Act. An item is probably void if not posted. A school district board must also adopt regulations to make sure the public can place matters affecting the district’s business on meeting agendas and to address the board on those items.

**Notice requirements for tax or assessment meetings and hearings**

The Brown Act prescribes specific procedures for adoption by a city, county, special district, or joint powers authority of any new or increased tax or assessment imposed on businesses. Though written broadly, these Brown Act provisions do not apply to new or increased real property taxes or assessments as those are governed by the California Constitution, Article XIIIC or XIIID, enacted by Proposition 218. At least one public meeting must be held to allow public testimony on the tax or assessment. In addition, there must also be at least 45 days notice of a public hearing at which the legislative body proposes to enact or increase the tax or assessment. Notice of the public meeting and public hearing must be provided at the same time and in the same document. The public notice relating to general taxes must be provided by newspaper publication. The public notice relating to new or increased business assessments must be provided through a mailing to all business owners proposed to be subject to the new or increased assessment. The agency may recover the reasonable costs of the public meetings, hearings, and notice.

The Brown Act exempts certain fees, standby or availability charges, recurring assessments, and new or increased assessments that are subject to the notice and hearing requirements of the Constitution. As a practical matter, the Constitution’s notice requirements have preempted this section of the Brown Act.
Non-agenda items
The Brown Act generally prohibits any action or discussion of items not on the posted agenda. However, there are three specific situations in which a legislative body can act on an item not on the agenda:23

- When a majority decides there is an “emergency situation” (as defined for emergency meetings);
- When two-thirds of the members present (or all members if less than two-thirds are present) determine there is a need for immediate action and the need to take action “came to the attention of the local agency subsequent to the agenda being posted.” This exception requires a degree of urgency. Further, an item cannot be considered under this provision if the legislative body or the staff knew about the need to take immediate action before the agenda was posted. A new need does not arise because staff forgot to put an item on the agenda or because an applicant missed a deadline; or
- When an item appeared on the agenda of, and was continued from, a meeting held not more than five days earlier.

The exceptions are narrow, as indicated by this list. The first two require a specific determination by the legislative body. That determination can be challenged in court and, if unsubstantiated, can lead to invalidation of an action.

“I’d like a two-thirds vote of the board, so we can go ahead and authorize commencement of phase two of the East Area Project,” said Chair Lopez.

“It’s not on the agenda. But we learned two days ago that we finished phase one of schedule — believe it or not — and I’d like to keep it that way. Do I hear a motion?”

The desire to stay ahead of schedule generally would not satisfy “a need for immediate action.” Too casual an action could invite a court challenge by a disgruntled resident. The prudent course is to place an item on the agenda for the next meeting and not risk invalidation.

“We learned this morning of an opportunity for a state grant,” said the chief engineer at the regular board meeting, “but our application has to be submitted in two days. We’d like the board to give us the go ahead tonight, even though it’s not on the agenda.”

A legitimate immediate need can be acted upon even though not on the posted agenda by following a two-step process:

- First, make two determinations: 1) that there is an immediate need to take action, and 2) that the need arose after the posting of the agenda. The matter is then placed on the agenda.
- Second, discuss and act on the added agenda item.

Responding to the public
The public can talk about anything within the jurisdiction of the legislative body, but the legislative body generally cannot act on or discuss an item not on the agenda. What happens when a member of the public raises a subject not on the agenda?
While the Brown Act does not allow discussion or action on items not on the agenda, it does allow members of the legislative body, or its staff, to “briefly respond” to comments or questions from members of the public, provide a reference to staff or other resources for factual information, or direct staff to place the issue on a future agenda. In addition, even without a comment from the public, a legislative body member or a staff member may ask for information, request a report back, request to place a matter on the agenda for a subsequent meeting (subject to the body’s rules or procedures), ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement, or briefly report on his or her own activities. However, caution should be used to avoid any discussion or action on such items.

Council Member Jefferson: I would like staff to respond to Resident Joe’s complaints during public comment about the repaving project on Elm Street — are there problems with this project?

City Manager Frank: The public works director has prepared a 45-minute power point presentation for you on the status of this project and will give it right now.

Council Member Brown: Take all the time you need; we need to get to the bottom of this. Our residents are unhappy.

*It is clear from this dialogue that the Elm Street project was not on the council’s agenda, but was raised during the public comment period for items not on the agenda. Council Member A properly asked staff to respond; the city manager should have given at most a brief response. If a lengthy report from the public works director was warranted, the city manager should have stated that it would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. Otherwise, both the long report and the likely discussion afterward will improperly embroil the council in a matter that is not listed on the agenda.*

**The right to attend and observe meetings**

A number of Brown Act provisions protect the public’s right to attend, observe, and participate in meetings.

Members of the public cannot be required to register their names, provide other information, complete a questionnaire, or otherwise “fulfill any condition precedent” to attending a meeting. Any attendance list, questionnaire, or similar document posted at or near the entrance to the meeting room or circulated at a meeting must clearly state that its completion is voluntary and that all persons may attend whether or not they fill it out.

No meeting can be held in a facility that prohibits attendance based on race, religion, color, national origin, ethnic group identification, age, sex, sexual orientation, or disability, or that is inaccessible to the disabled. Nor can a meeting be held where the public must make a payment or purchase in order to be present. This does not mean, however, that the public is entitled to free entry to a conference attended by a majority of the legislative body.

While a legislative body may use teleconferencing in connection with a meeting, the public must be given notice of and access to the teleconference location. Members of the public must be able to address the legislative body from the teleconference location.
Action by secret ballot, whether preliminary or final, is flatly prohibited.\textsuperscript{29} 

All actions taken by the legislative body in open session, and the vote of each member thereon, must be disclosed to the public at the time the action is taken.\textsuperscript{30}

**Q:** The agenda calls for election of the legislative body’s officers. Members of the legislative body want to cast unsigned written ballots that would be tallied by the clerk, who would announce the results. Is this voting process permissible?

**A:** No. The possibility that a public vote might cause hurt feelings among members of the legislative body or might be awkward — or even counterproductive — does not justify a secret ballot.

The legislative body may remove persons from a meeting who willfully interrupt proceedings.\textsuperscript{31} Ejection is justified only when audience members actually disrupt the proceedings.\textsuperscript{32} If order cannot be restored after ejecting disruptive persons, the meeting room may be cleared. Members of the news media who have not participated in the disturbance must be allowed to continue to attend the meeting. The legislative body may establish a procedure to re-admit an individual or individuals not responsible for the disturbance.\textsuperscript{33}

**Records and recordings**

The public has the right to review agendas and other writings distributed by any person to a majority of the legislative body in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at a meeting. Except for privileged documents, those materials are public records and must be made available upon request without delay.\textsuperscript{34} A fee or deposit as permitted by the California Public Records Act may be charged for a copy of a public record.\textsuperscript{35}

**Q:** In connection with an upcoming hearing on a discretionary use permit, counsel for the legislative body transmits a memorandum to all members of the body outlining the litigation risks in granting or denying the permit. Must this memorandum be included in the packet of agenda materials available to the public?

**A:** No. The memorandum is a privileged attorney-client communication.

**Q:** In connection with an agenda item calling for the legislative body to approve a contract, staff submits to all members of the body a financial analysis explaining why the terms of the contract favor the local agency. Must this memorandum be included in the packet of agenda materials available to the public?

**A:** Yes. The memorandum has been distributed to the majority of the legislative body, relates to the subject matter of a meeting, and is not a privileged communication.
A legislative body may discuss or act on some matters without considering written materials. But if writings are distributed to a majority of a legislative body in connection with an agenda item, they must also be available to the public. A non-exempt or otherwise privileged writing distributed to a majority of the legislative body less than 72 hours before the meeting must be made available for inspection at the time of distribution at a public office or location designated for that purpose; and the agendas for all meetings of the legislative body must include the address of this office or location.36 A writing distributed during a meeting must be made public:

- At the meeting if prepared by the local agency or a member of its legislative body; or
- After the meeting if prepared by some other person.37

Any tape or film record of an open and public meeting made for whatever purpose by or at the direction of the local agency is subject to the California Public Records Act; however, it may be erased or destroyed 30 days after the taping or recording. Any inspection of a video or tape recording is to be provided without charge on a video or tape player made available by the local agency.38 The agency may impose its ordinary charge for copies that is consistent with the California Public Records Act.39

In addition, the public is specifically allowed to use audio or video tape recorders or still or motion picture cameras at a meeting to record the proceedings, absent a reasonable finding by the legislative body that noise, illumination, or obstruction of view caused by recorders or cameras would persistently disrupt the proceedings.40

Similarly, a legislative body cannot prohibit or restrict the public broadcast of its open and public meetings without making a reasonable finding that the noise, illumination, or obstruction of view would persistently disrupt the proceedings.41

The public’s place on the agenda

Every agenda for a regular meeting must allow members of the public to speak on any item of interest, so long as the item is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body. Further, the public must be allowed to speak on a specific item of business before or during the legislative body’s consideration of it.42

Q. Must the legislative body allow members of the public to show videos or make a power point presentation during the public comment part of the agenda, as long as the subject matter is relevant to the agency and is within the established time limit?

A. Probably, although the agency is under no obligation to provide equipment.

Moreover, the legislative body cannot prohibit public criticism of policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency or the acts or omissions of the legislative body itself. But the Brown Act provides no immunity for defamatory statements.43
Q. May the presiding officer prohibit a member of the audience from publicly criticizing an agency employee by name during public comments?

A. No, as long as the criticism pertains to job performance.

Q. During the public comment period of a regular meeting of the legislative body, a resident urges the public to support and vote for a candidate vying for election to the body. May the presiding officer gavel the speaker out of order for engaging in political campaign speech?

A. There is no case law on this subject. Some would argue that campaign issues are outside the subject matter jurisdiction of the body within the meaning of Section 54954.3(a). Others take the view that the speech must be allowed under paragraph (c) of that section because it is relevant to the governing of the agency and an implicit criticism of the incumbents.

The legislative body may adopt reasonable regulations, including time limits, on public comments. Such regulations should be enforced fairly and without regard to speakers’ viewpoints. The legislative body has discretion to modify its regulations regarding time limits on public comment if necessary. For example, the time limit could be shortened to accommodate a lengthy agenda or lengthened to allow additional time for discussion on a complicated matter.44

The public does not need to be given an opportunity to speak on an item that has already been considered by a committee made up exclusively of members of the legislative body at a public meeting, if all interested members of the public had the opportunity to speak on the item before or during its consideration, and if the item has not been substantially changed.45

Notices and agendas for special meetings must also give members of the public the opportunity to speak before or during consideration of an item on the agenda but need not allow members of the public an opportunity to speak on other matters within the jurisdiction of the legislative body.46
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Chapter 5

CLOSED SESSIONS

A closed session is a meeting of a legislative body conducted in private without the attendance of the public or press. A legislative body is authorized to meet in closed session only to the extent expressly authorized by the Brown Act.¹

As summarized in Chapter 1 of this Guide, it is clear that the Brown Act must be interpreted liberally in favor of open meetings, and exceptions that limit public access (including the exceptions for closed session meetings) must be narrowly construed.² The most common purposes of the closed session provisions in the Brown Act are to avoid revealing confidential information (e.g., prejudicing the city’s position in litigation or compromising the privacy interests of employees). Closed sessions should be conducted keeping those narrow purposes in mind. It is not enough that a subject is sensitive, embarrassing, or controversial. Without specific authority in the Brown Act for a closed session, a matter to be considered by a legislative body must be discussed in public. As an example, a board of police commissioners cannot meet in closed session to provide general policy guidance to a police chief, even though some matters are sensitive and the commission considers their disclosure contrary to the public interest.³

In this chapter, the grounds for convening a closed session are called “exceptions” because they are exceptions to the general rule that meetings must be conducted openly. In some circumstances, none of the closed session exceptions apply to an issue or information the legislative body wishes to discuss privately. In these cases, it is not proper to convene a closed session, even to protect confidential information. For example, although the Brown Act does authorize closed sessions related to specified types of contracts (e.g., specified provisions of real property agreements, employee labor agreements, and litigation settlement agreements),⁴ the Brown Act does not authorize closed sessions for other contract negotiations.

Agendas and reports

Closed session items must be briefly described on the posted agenda and the description must state the specific statutory exemption.⁵ An item that appears on the open meeting portion of the agenda may not be taken into closed session until it has been properly agendized as a closed session item or unless it is properly added as a closed session item by a two-thirds vote of the body after making the appropriate urgency findings.⁶

The Brown Act supplies a series of fill in the blank sample agenda descriptions for various types of authorized closed sessions, which provide a “safe harbor” from legal attacks. These sample
agenda descriptions cover license and permit determinations, real property negotiations, existing or anticipated litigation, liability claims, threats to security, public employee appointments, evaluations and discipline, labor negotiations, multi-jurisdictional law enforcement cases, hospital boards of directors, medical quality assurance committees, joint powers agencies, and audits by the California State Auditor’s Office.7

If the legislative body intends to convene in closed session, it must include the section of the Brown Act authorizing the closed session in advance on the agenda and it must make a public announcement prior to the closed session discussion. In most cases, the announcement may simply be a reference to the agenda item.8

Following a closed session, the legislative body must provide an oral or written report on certain actions taken and the vote of every elected member present. The timing and content of the report varies according to the reason for the closed session and the action taken.9 The announcements may be made at the site of the closed session, so long as the public is allowed to be present to hear them.

If there is a standing or written request for documentation, any copies of contracts, settlement agreements, or other documents finally approved or adopted in closed session must be provided to the requestor(s) after the closed session, if final approval of such documents does not rest with any other party to the contract or settlement. If substantive amendments to a contract or settlement agreement approved by all parties requires retyping, such documents may be held until retyping is completed during normal business hours, but the substance of the changes must be summarized for any person inquiring about them.10

The Brown Act does not require minutes, including minutes of closed sessions. However, a legislative body may adopt an ordinance or resolution to authorize a confidential “minute book” be kept to record actions taken at closed sessions.11 If one is kept, it must be made available to members of the legislative body, provided that the member asking to review minutes of a particular meeting was not disqualified from attending the meeting due to a conflict of interest.12 A court may order the disclosure of minute books for the court’s review if a lawsuit makes sufficient claims of an open meeting violation.

Litigation

There is an attorney/client relationship, and legal counsel may use it to protect the confidentiality of privileged written and oral communications to members of the legislative body — outside of meetings. But protection of the attorney/client privilege cannot by itself be the reason for a closed session.13

The Brown Act expressly authorizes closed sessions to discuss what is considered pending litigation. The rules that apply to holding a litigation closed session involve complex, technical definitions and procedures. The essential thing to know is that a closed session can be held by the body to confer with, or receive advice from, its legal counsel when open discussion would prejudice the position of the local agency in litigation in which the agency is, or could become, a party.14 The litigation exception under the Brown Act is narrowly construed and does not permit activities beyond a legislative body’s conferring with its own legal counsel and required support staff.15 For example, it is not permissible to hold a closed session in which settlement negotiations take place between a legislative body, a representative of an adverse party, and a mediator.16
The California Attorney General has opined that if the agency’s attorney is not a participant, a litigation closed session cannot be held. In any event, local agency officials should always consult the agency’s attorney before placing this type of closed session on the agenda in order to be certain that it is being done properly.

Before holding a closed session under the pending litigation exception, the legislative body must publicly state the basis for the closed session by identifying one of the following three types of matters: existing litigation, anticipated exposure to litigation, or anticipated initiation of litigation.

**Existing litigation**

**Q.** May the legislative body agree to settle a lawsuit in a properly-noticed closed session, without placing the settlement agreement on an open session agenda for public approval?

**A.** Yes, but the settlement agreement is a public document and must be disclosed on request. Furthermore, a settlement agreement cannot commit the agency to matters that are required to have public hearings.

Existing litigation includes any adjudicatory proceedings before a court, administrative body exercising its adjudicatory authority, hearing officer, or arbitrator. The clearest situation in which a closed session is authorized is when the local agency meets with its legal counsel to discuss a pending matter that has been filed in a court or with an administrative agency and names the local agency as a party. The legislative body may meet under these circumstances to receive updates on the case from attorneys, participate in developing strategy as the case develops, or consider alternatives for resolution of the case. Generally, an agreement to settle litigation may be approved in closed session. However, an agreement to settle litigation cannot be approved in closed session if it commits the city to take an action that is required to have a public hearing.

**Anticipated exposure to litigation against the local agency**

Closed sessions are authorized for legal counsel to inform the legislative body of a significant exposure to litigation against the local agency, but only if based on “existing facts and circumstances” as defined by the Brown Act. The legislative body may also meet under this exception to determine whether a closed session is authorized based on information provided by legal counsel or staff. In general, the “existing facts and circumstances” must be publicly disclosed unless they are privileged written communications or not yet known to a potential plaintiff.

**Anticipated initiation of litigation by the local agency**

A closed session may be held under the exception for the anticipated initiation of litigation when the legislative body seeks legal advice on whether to protect the agency’s rights and interests by initiating litigation.

Certain actions must be reported in open session at the same meeting following the closed
session. Other actions, as where final approval rests with another party or the court, may be announced when they become final and upon inquiry of any person. Each agency attorney should be aware of and make the disclosures that are required by the particular circumstances.

**Real estate negotiations**

A legislative body may meet in closed session with its negotiator to discuss the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease of real property by or for the local agency. A “lease” includes a lease renewal or renegotiation. The purpose is to grant authority to the legislative body’s negotiator on price and terms of payment. Caution should be exercised to limit discussion to price and terms of payment without straying to other related issues such as site design, architecture, or other aspects of the project for which the transaction is contemplated.

Q. May other terms of a real estate transaction, aside from price and terms of payment, be addressed in closed session?

A. No. However, there are differing opinions over the scope of the phrase “price and terms of payment” in connection with real estate closed sessions. Many agency attorneys argue that any term that directly affects the economic value of the transaction falls within the ambit of “price and terms of payment.” Others take a narrower, more literal view of the phrase.

The agency’s negotiator may be a member of the legislative body itself. Prior to the closed session, or on the agenda, the legislative body must identify its negotiators, the real property that the negotiations may concern and the names of the parties with whom its negotiator may negotiate.

After real estate negotiations are concluded, the approval and substance of the agreement must be publicly reported. If its own approval makes the agreement final, the body must report in open session at the public meeting during which the closed session is held. If final approval rests with another party, the local agency must report the approval and the substance of the agreement upon inquiry by any person, as soon as the agency is informed of it.

“Our population is exploding, and we have to think about new school sites,” said Board Member Jefferson.

“Not only that,” interjected Board Member Tanaka, “we need to get rid of a couple of our older facilities.”

“Well, obviously the place to do that is in a closed session,” said Board Member O’Reilly. “Otherwise we’re going to set off land speculation. And if we even mention closing a school, parents are going to be in an uproar.”

A closed session to discuss potential sites is not authorized by the Brown Act. The exception is limited to meeting with its negotiator over specific sites — which must be identified at an open and public meeting.
Public employment

The Brown Act authorizes a closed session “to consider the appointment, employment, evaluation of performance, discipline, or dismissal of a public employee or to hear complaints or charges brought against the employee.” The purpose of this exception — commonly referred to as the “personnel exception” — is to avoid undue publicity or embarrassment for an employee or applicant for employment and to allow full and candid discussion by the legislative body; thus, it is restricted to discussing individuals, not general personnel policies. The body must possess the power to appoint, evaluate, or dismiss the employee to hold a closed session under this exception. That authority may be delegated to a subsidiary appointed body.

An employee must be given at least 24 hours notice of any closed session convened to hear specific complaints or charges against him or her. This occurs when the legislative body is reviewing evidence, which could include live testimony, and adjudicating conflicting testimony offered as evidence. A legislative body may examine (or exclude) witnesses, and the California Attorney General has opined that, when an affected employee and advocate have an official or essential role to play, they may be permitted to participate in the closed session. The employee has the right to have the specific complaints and charges discussed in a public session rather than closed session. If the employee is not given the 24-hour prior notice, any disciplinary action is null and void.

However, an employee is not entitled to notice and a hearing where the purpose of the closed session is to consider a performance evaluation. The Attorney General and the courts have determined that personnel performance evaluations do not constitute complaints and charges, which are more akin to accusations made against a person.

Q. Must 24 hours notice be given to an employee whose negative performance evaluation is to be considered by the legislative body in closed session?

A. No, the notice is reserved for situations where the body is to hear complaints and charges from witnesses.

Correct labeling of the closed session on the agenda is critical. A closed session agenda that identified discussion of an employment contract was not sufficient to allow dismissal of an employee. An incorrect agenda description can result in invalidation of an action and much embarrassment.

For purposes of the personnel exception, “employee” specifically includes an officer or an independent contractor who functions as an officer or an employee. Examples of the former include a city manager, district general manager or superintendent. Examples of the latter include a legal counsel or engineer hired on contract to act as local agency attorney or chief engineer.

Elected officials, appointees to the governing body or subsidiary bodies, and independent contractors other than those discussed above are not employees for purposes of the personnel exception. Action on individuals who are not “employees” must also be public — including discussing and voting on appointees to committees, or debating the merits of independent contractors, or considering a complaint against a member of the legislative body itself.
The personnel exception specifically prohibits discussion or action on proposed compensation in closed session, except for a disciplinary reduction in pay. Among other things, that means there can be no personnel closed sessions on a salary change (other than a disciplinary reduction) between any unrepresented individual and the legislative body. However, a legislative body may address the compensation of an unrepresented individual, such as a city manager, in a closed session as part of a labor negotiation (discussed later in this chapter), yet another example of the importance of using correct agenda descriptions.

Reclassification of a job must be public, but an employee’s ability to fill that job may be considered in closed session.

Any closed session action to appoint, employ, dismiss, accept the resignation of, or otherwise affect the employment status of a public employee must be reported at the public meeting during which the closed session is held. That report must identify the title of the position, but not the names of all persons considered for an employment position. However, a report on a dismissal or non-renewal of an employment contract must be deferred until administrative remedies, if any, are exhausted.

“I have some important news to announce,” said Mayor Garcia. “We’ve decided to terminate the contract of the city manager, effective immediately. The council has met in closed session and we’ve negotiated six months severance pay.”

“Unfortunately, that has some serious budget consequences, so we’ve had to delay phase two of the East Area Project.”

This may be an improper use of the personnel closed session if the council agenda described the item as the city manager’s evaluation. In addition, other than labor negotiations, any action on individual compensation must be taken in open session. Caution should be exercised to not discuss in closed session issues, such as budget impacts in this hypothetical, beyond the scope of the posted closed session notice.

**Labor negotiations**

The Brown Act allows closed sessions for some aspects of labor negotiations. Different provisions (discussed below) apply to school and community college districts.

A legislative body may meet in closed session to instruct its bargaining representatives, which may be one or more of its members, on employee salaries and fringe benefits for both represented (“union”) and non-represented employees. For represented employees, it may also consider working conditions that by law require negotiation. For the purpose of labor negotiation closed sessions, an “employee” includes an officer or an independent contractor who functions as an officer or an employee, but independent contractors who do not serve in the capacity of an officer or employee are not covered by this closed session exception.

These closed sessions may take place before or during negotiations with employee representatives. Prior to the closed session, the legislative body must hold an open and public session in which it identifies its designated representatives.
During its discussions with representatives on salaries and fringe benefits, the legislative body may also discuss available funds and funding priorities, but only to instruct its representative. The body may also meet in closed session with a conciliator who has intervened in negotiations.42

The approval of an agreement concluding labor negotiations with represented employees must be reported after the agreement is final and has been accepted or ratified by the other party. The report must identify the item approved and the other party or parties to the negotiation.43 The labor closed sessions specifically cannot include final action on proposed compensation of one or more unrepresented employees.

**Labor negotiations — school and community college districts**

Employee relations for school districts and community college districts are governed by the Rodda Act, where different meeting and special notice provisions apply. The entire board, for example, may negotiate in closed sessions.

Four types of meetings are exempted from compliance with the Rodda Act:

1. A negotiating session with a recognized or certified employee organization;
2. A meeting of a mediator with either side;
3. A hearing or meeting held by a fact finder or arbitrator; and
4. A session between the board and its bargaining agent, or the board alone, to discuss its position regarding employee working conditions and instruct its agent.44

Public participation under the Rodda Act also takes another form.45 All initial proposals of both sides must be presented at public meetings and are public records. The public must be given reasonable time to inform itself and to express its views before the district may adopt its initial proposal. In addition, new topics of negotiations must be made public within 24 hours. Any votes on such a topic must be followed within 24 hours by public disclosure of the vote of each member.46 The final vote must be in public.

**Other Education Code exceptions**

The Education Code governs student disciplinary meetings by boards of school districts and community college districts. District boards may hold a closed session to consider the suspension or discipline of a student, if a public hearing would reveal personal, disciplinary, or academic information about the student contrary to state and federal pupil privacy law. The student’s parent or guardian may request an open meeting.47

Community college districts may also hold closed sessions to discuss some student disciplinary matters, awarding of honorary degrees, or gifts from donors who prefer to remain anonymous.48 Kindergarten through 12th grade districts may also meet in closed session to review the contents of the statewide assessment instrument.49

**Joint Powers Authorities**

The legislative body of a joint powers authority may adopt a policy regarding limitations on disclosure of confidential information obtained in closed session, and may meet in closed session to discuss information that is subject to the policy.50
License applicants with criminal records

A closed session is permitted when an applicant, who has a criminal record, applies for a license or license renewal and the legislative body wishes to discuss whether the applicant is sufficiently rehabilitated to receive the license. The applicant and the applicant’s attorney are authorized to attend the closed session meeting. If the body decides to deny the license, the applicant may withdraw the application. If the applicant does not withdraw, the body must deny the license in public, immediately or at its next meeting. No information from the closed session can be revealed without consent of the applicant, unless the applicant takes action to challenge the denial.51

Public security

Legislative bodies may meet in closed session to discuss matters posing a threat to the security of public buildings, essential public services, including water, sewer, gas, or electric service, or to the public’s right of access to public services or facilities over which the legislative body has jurisdiction. Closed session meetings for these purposes must be held with designated security or law enforcement officials including the Governor, Attorney General, district attorney, agency attorney, sheriff or chief of police, or their deputies or agency security consultant or security operations manager.52 Action taken in closed session with respect to such public security issues is not reportable action.

Multijurisdictional law enforcement agency

A joint powers agency formed to provide law enforcement services (involving drugs; gangs; sex crimes; firearms trafficking; felony possession of a firearm; high technology, computer, or identity theft; human trafficking; or vehicle theft) to multiple jurisdictions may hold closed sessions to discuss case records of an on-going criminal investigation, to hear testimony from persons involved in the investigation, and to discuss courses of action in particular cases.53 The exception applies to the legislative body of the joint powers agency and to any body advisory to it. The purpose is to prevent impairment of investigations, to protect witnesses and informants, and to permit discussion of effective courses of action.54

Hospital peer review and trade secrets

Two specific kinds of closed sessions are allowed for district hospitals and municipal hospitals, under other provisions of law.55

1. A meeting to hear reports of hospital medical audit or quality assurance committees, or for related deliberations. However, an applicant or medical staff member whose staff privileges are the direct subject of a hearing may request a public hearing.

2. A meeting to discuss “reports involving trade secrets” — provided no action is taken.

A “trade secret” is defined as information which is not generally known to the public or competitors and which: 1) “derives independent economic value, actual or potential” by virtue of its restricted knowledge; 2) is necessary to initiate a new hospital service or program or facility; and 3) would, if prematurely disclosed, create a substantial probability of depriving the hospital of a substantial economic benefit.

The provision prohibits use of closed sessions to discuss transitions in ownership or management, or the district’s dissolution.56
Other legislative bases for closed session

Since any closed session meeting of a legislative body must be authorized by the Legislature, it is important to carefully review the Brown Act to determine if there is a provision that authorizes a closed session for a particular subject matter. There are some less frequently encountered topics that are authorized to be discussed by a legislative body in closed session under the Brown Act, including: a response to a confidential final draft audit report from the Bureau of State Audits; consideration of the purchase or sale of particular pension fund investments by a legislative body of a local agency that invests pension funds; hearing a charge or complaint from a member enrolled in a health plan by a legislative body of a local agency that provides Medi-Cal services; discussions by a county board of supervisors that governs a health plan licensed pursuant to the Knox-Keene Health Care Services Plan Act related to trade secrets or contract negotiations concerning rates of payment, and discussions by an insurance pooling joint powers agency related to a claim filed against, or liability of, the agency or a member of the agency.

Who may attend closed sessions

Meetings of a legislative body are either fully open or fully closed; there is nothing in between. Therefore, local agency officials and employees must pay particular attention to the authorized attendees for the particular type of closed session. As summarized above, the authorized attendees may differ based on the topic of the closed session. Closed sessions may involve only the members of the legislative body and only agency counsel, management and support staff, and consultants necessary for consideration of the matter that is the subject of closed session, with very limited exceptions for adversaries or witnesses with official roles in particular types of hearings (e.g., personnel disciplinary hearings and license hearings). In any case, individuals who do not have an official role in the closed session subject matters must be excluded from closed sessions.

Q. May the lawyer for someone suing the agency attend a closed session in order to explain to the legislative body why it should accept a settlement offer?
A. No, attendance in closed sessions is reserved exclusively for the agency’s advisors.

The confidentiality of closed session discussions

The Brown Act explicitly prohibits the unauthorized disclosure of confidential information acquired in a closed session by any person present, and offers various remedies to address breaches of confidentiality. It is incumbent upon all those attending lawful closed sessions to protect the confidentiality of those discussions. One court has held that members of a legislative body cannot be compelled to divulge the content of closed session discussions through the discovery process. Only the legislative body acting as a body may agree to divulge confidential closed session information; regarding attorney/client privileged communications, the entire body is the holder of the privilege and only the entire body can decide to waive the privilege.
Before adoption of the Brown Act provision specifically prohibiting disclosure of closed session communications, agency attorneys and the Attorney General long opined that officials have a fiduciary duty to protect the confidentiality of closed session discussions. The Attorney General issued an opinion that it is “improper” for officials to disclose information received during a closed session regarding pending litigation, though the Attorney General has also concluded that a local agency is preempted from adopting an ordinance criminalizing public disclosure of closed session discussions. In any event, in 2002, the Brown Act was amended to prescribe particular remedies for breaches of confidentiality. These remedies include injunctive relief; and, if the breach is a willful disclosure of confidential information, the remedies include disciplinary action against an employee, and referral of a member of the legislative body to the grand jury.

The duty of maintaining confidentiality, of course, must give way to the responsibility to disclose improper matters or discussions that may come up in closed sessions. In recognition of this public policy, under the Brown Act, a local agency may not penalize a disclosure of information learned during a closed session if the disclosure: 1) is made in confidence to the district attorney or the grand jury due to a perceived violation of law; 2) is an expression of opinion concerning the propriety or legality of actions taken in closed session, including disclosure of the nature and extent of the illegal action; or 3) is information that is not confidential.

The interplay between these possible sanctions and an official’s first amendment rights is complex and beyond the scope of this guide. Suffice it to say that this is a matter of great sensitivity and controversy.

“I want the press to know that I voted in closed session against filing the eminent domain action,” said Council Member Chang.

“Don’t settle too soon,” reveals Council Member Watson to the property owner, over coffee. “The city’s offer coming your way is not our bottom line.”

The interplay between these possible sanctions and an official’s first amendment rights is complex and beyond the scope of this guide. Suffice it to say that this is a matter of great sensitivity and controversy.

“I want the press to know that I voted in closed session against filing the eminent domain action,” said Council Member Chang.

“Don’t settle too soon,” reveals Council Member Watson to the property owner, over coffee. “The city’s offer coming your way is not our bottom line.”

The first comment to the press may be appropriate if it is a part of an action taken by the City Council in closed session that must be reported publicly. The second comment to the property owner is not — disclosure of confidential information acquired in closed session is expressly prohibited and harmful to the agency.
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Certain violations of the Brown Act are designated as misdemeanors, although by far the most commonly used enforcement provisions are those that authorize civil actions to invalidate specified actions taken in violation of the Brown Act and to stop or prevent future violations. Still, despite all the safeguards and remedies to enforce them, it is ultimately impossible for the public to monitor every aspect of public officials’ interactions. Compliance ultimately results from regular training and a good measure of self-regulation on the part of public officials. This chapter discusses the remedies available to the public when that self-regulation is ineffective.

### Invalidation

Any interested person, including the district attorney, may seek to invalidate certain actions of a legislative body on the ground that they violate the Brown Act.\(^1\) Violations of the Brown Act, however, cannot be invalidated if they involve the following types of actions:

- Those taken in substantial compliance with the law. No Brown Act violation is found when the given notice substantially complies with the Brown Act, even when the notice erroneously cites to the wrong Brown Act section, but adequately advises the public that the Board will meet with legal counsel to discuss potential litigation in closed session;\(^2\)
- Those involving the sale or issuance of notes, bonds or other indebtedness, or any related contracts or agreements;
- Those creating a contractual obligation, including a contract awarded by competitive bid for other than compensation for professional services, upon which a party has in good faith relied to its detriment;
- Those connected with the collection of any tax; or
- Those in which the complaining party had actual notice at least 72 hours prior to the regular meeting or 24 hours prior to the special meeting, as the case may be, at which the action is taken.

Before filing a court action seeking invalidation, a person who believes that a violation has occurred must send a written “cure or correct” demand to the legislative body. This demand must clearly describe the challenged action and the nature of the claimed violation. This demand must be sent within 90 days of the alleged violation or 30 days if the action was taken in open session but in violation of Section 54954.2, which requires (subject to specific exceptions) that only properly agendized items are acted on by the governing body during a meeting.\(^3\) The legislative body then has up to 30 days to cure and correct its action. If it does not act, any lawsuit must be filed within the next 15 days. The purpose of this requirement is to offer the body an opportunity to consider whether a violation has occurred and to weigh its options before litigation is filed.
Although just about anyone has standing to bring an action for invalidation,⁴ the challenger must show prejudice as a result of the alleged violation.⁵ An action to invalidate fails to state a cause of action against the agency if the body deliberated but did not take an action.⁶

### Applicability to Past Actions

Any interested person, including the district attorney, may file a civil action to determine whether past actions of a legislative body occurring on or after January 1, 2013 constitute violations of the Brown Act and are subject to a mandamus, injunction, or declaratory relief action.⁷ Before filing an action, the interested person must, within nine months of the alleged violation of the Brown Act, submit a “cease and desist” letter to the legislative body, clearly describing the past action and the nature of the alleged violation.⁸ The legislative body has 30 days after receipt of the letter to provide an unconditional commitment to cease and desist from the past action.⁹ If the body fails to take any action within the 30-day period or takes an action other than an unconditional commitment, a lawsuit may be filed within 60 days.¹⁰

The legislative body’s unconditional commitment must be approved at a regular or special meeting as a separate item of business and not on the consent calendar.¹¹ The unconditional commitment must be substantially in the form set forth in the Brown Act.¹² No legal action may thereafter be commenced regarding the past action.¹³ However, an action of the legislative body in violation of its unconditional commitment constitutes an independent violation of the Brown Act and a legal action consequently may be commenced without following the procedural requirements for challenging past actions.¹⁴

The legislative body may rescind its prior unconditional commitment by a majority vote of its membership at a regular meeting as a separate item of business not on the consent calendar. At least 30 days written notice of the intended rescission must be given to each person to whom the unconditional commitment was made and to the district attorney. Upon rescission, any interested person may commence a legal action regarding the past actions without following the procedural requirements for challenging past actions.¹⁵

### Civil action to prevent future violations

The district attorney or any interested person can file a civil action asking the court to:

- Stop or prevent violations or threatened violations of the Brown Act by members of the legislative body of a local agency;
- Determine the applicability of the Brown Act to actions or threatened future action of the legislative body;
- Determine whether any rule or action by the legislative body to penalize or otherwise discourage the expression of one or more of its members is valid under state or federal law; or
- Compel the legislative body to tape record its closed sessions.

**PRACTICE TIP:** A lawsuit to invalidate must be preceded by a demand to cure and correct the challenged action in order to give the legislative body an opportunity to consider its options. The Brown Act does not specify how to cure or correct a violation; the best method is to rescind the action being complained of and start over, or reaffirm the action if the local agency relied on the action and rescinding the action would prejudice the local agency.
It is not necessary for a challenger to prove a past pattern or practice of violations by the local agency in order to obtain injunctive relief. A court may presume when issuing an injunction that a single violation will continue in the future where the public agency refuses to admit to the alleged violation or to renounce or curtail the practice.\(^{16}\) Note, however, that a court may not compel elected officials to disclose their recollections of what transpired in a closed session.\(^ {17}\)

Upon finding a violation of the Brown Act pertaining to closed sessions, a court may compel the legislative body to tape record its future closed sessions. In a subsequent lawsuit to enforce the Brown Act alleging a violation occurring in closed session, a court may upon motion of the plaintiff review the tapes if there is good cause to think the Brown Act has been violated, and make public the relevant portion of the closed session recording.

**Costs and attorney’s fees**

Someone who successfully invalidates an action taken in violation of the Brown Act or who successfully enforces one of the Brown Act’s civil remedies may seek court costs and reasonable attorney’s fees. Courts have held that attorney’s fees must be awarded to a successful plaintiff unless special circumstances exist that would make a fee award against the public agency unjust.\(^ {18}\) When evaluating how to respond to assertions that the Brown Act has been violated, elected officials and their lawyers should assume that attorney’s fees will be awarded against the agency if a violation of the Act is proven.

An attorney’s fee award may only be directed against the local agency and not the individual members of the legislative body. If the local agency prevails, it may be awarded court costs and attorney’s fees if the court finds the lawsuit was clearly frivolous and lacking in merit.\(^ {19}\)

**Criminal complaints**

A violation of the Brown Act by a member of the legislative body who acts with the improper intent described below is punishable as a misdemeanor.\(^ {20}\)

A criminal violation has two components. The first is that there must be an overt act — a member of a legislative body must attend a meeting at which action is taken in violation of the Brown Act.\(^ {21}\) “Action taken” is not only an actual vote, but also a collective decision, commitment or promise by a majority of the legislative body to make a positive or negative decision.\(^ {22}\) If the meeting involves mere deliberation without the taking of action, there can be no misdemeanor penalty.

A violation occurs for a tentative as well as final decision.\(^ {23}\) In fact, criminal liability is triggered by a member’s participation in a meeting in violation of the Brown Act — not whether that member has voted with the majority or minority, or has voted at all.

The second component of a criminal violation is that action is taken with the intent of a member “to deprive the public of information to which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled” by the Brown Act.\(^ {24}\)

PRACTICE TIP: Attorney’s fees will likely be awarded if a violation of the Brown Act is proven.
As with other misdemeanors, the filing of a complaint is up to the district attorney. Although criminal prosecutions of the Brown Act are uncommon, district attorneys in some counties aggressively monitor public agencies’ adherence to the requirements of the law.

Some attorneys and district attorneys take the position that a Brown Act violation may be pursued criminally under Government Code section 1222.25 There is no case law to support this view; if anything, the existence of an express criminal remedy within the Brown Act would suggest otherwise.26

**Voluntary resolution**

Arguments over Brown Act issues often become emotional on all sides. Newspapers trumpet relatively minor violations, unhappy residents fume over an action, and legislative bodies clam up about information better discussed in public. Hard lines are drawn and rational discussion breaks down. The district attorney or even the grand jury occasionally becomes involved. Publicity surrounding alleged violations of the Brown Act can result in a loss of confidence by constituents in the legislative body. There are times when it may be preferable to consider re-noticing and rehearing, rather than litigating, an item of significant public interest, particularly when there is any doubt about whether the open meeting requirements were satisfied.

At bottom, agencies that regularly train their officials and pay close attention to the requirements of the Brown Act will have little reason to worry about enforcement.

**ENDNOTES:**
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15 Government Code Section 54960.2(e)
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Introduction

The rules of procedure at meetings should be simple enough for most people to understand. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case. Virtually all clubs, associations, boards, councils and bodies follow a set of rules — Robert’s Rules of Order — which are embodied in a small, but complex, book. Virtually no one I know has actually read this book cover to cover. Worse yet, the book was written for another time and for another purpose. If one is chairing or running a parliament, then Robert’s Rules of Order is a dandy and quite useful handbook for procedure in that complex setting. On the other hand, if one is running a meeting of say, a five-member body with a few members of the public in attendance, a simplified version of the rules of parliamentary procedure is in order.

Hence, the birth of Rosenberg’s Rules of Order.

What follows is my version of the rules of parliamentary procedure, based on my decades of experience chairing meetings in state and local government. These rules have been simplified for the smaller bodies we chair or in which we participate, slimmer down for the 21st Century, yet retaining the basic tenets of order to which we have grown accustomed. Interestingly enough, Rosenberg’s Rules has found a welcoming audience. Hundreds of cities, counties, special districts, committees, boards, commissions, neighborhood associations and private corporations and companies have adopted Rosenberg’s Rules in lieu of Robert’s Rules because they have found them practical, logical, simple, easy to learn and user friendly.

This treatise on modern parliamentary procedure is built on a foundation supported by the following four pillars:

1. **Rules should establish order.** The first purpose of rules of parliamentary procedure is to establish a framework for the orderly conduct of meetings.

2. **Rules should be clear.** Simple rules lead to wider understanding and participation. Complex rules create two classes: those who understand and participate; and those who do not fully understand and do not fully participate.

3. **Rules should be user friendly.** That is, the rules must be simple enough that the public is invited into the body and feels that it has participated in the process.

4. **Rules should enforce the will of the majority while protecting the rights of the minority.** The ultimate purpose of rules of procedure is to encourage discussion and to facilitate decision making by the body. In a democracy, majority rules. The rules must enable the majority to express itself and fashion a result, while permitting the minority to also express itself, but not dominate, while fully participating in the process.

Establishing a Quorum

The starting point for a meeting is the establishment of a quorum. A quorum is defined as the minimum number of members of the body who must be present at a meeting for business to be legally transacted. The default rule is that a quorum is one more than half the body. For example, in a five-member body a quorum is three. When the body has three members present, it can legally transact business. If the body has less than a quorum of members present, it cannot legally transact business. And even if the body has a quorum to begin the meeting, the body can lose the quorum during the meeting when a member departs (or even when a member leaves the dais). When that occurs the body loses its ability to transact business until and unless a quorum is reestablished.

The default rule, identified above, however, gives way to a specific rule of the body that establishes a quorum. For example, the rules of a particular five-member body may indicate that a quorum is four members for that particular body. The body must follow the rules it has established for its quorum. In the absence of such a specific rule, the quorum is one more than half the members of the body.

The Role of the Chair

While all members of the body should know and understand the rules of parliamentary procedure, it is the chair of the body who is charged with applying the rules of conduct of the meeting. The chair should be well versed in those rules. For all intents and purposes, the chair makes the final ruling on the rules every time the chair states an action. In fact, all decisions by the chair are final unless overruled by the body itself.

Since the chair runs the conduct of the meeting, it is usual courtesy for the chair to play a less active role in the debate and discussion than other members of the body. This does not mean that the chair should not participate in the debate or discussion. To the contrary, as a member of the body, the chair has the full right to participate in the debate, discussion and decision-making of the body. What the chair should do, however, is strive to be the last to speak at the discussion and debate stage. The chair should not make or second a motion unless the chair is convinced that no other member of the body will do so at that point in time.

The Basic Format for an Agenda Item Discussion

Formal meetings normally have a written, often published agenda. Informal meetings may have only an oral or understood agenda. In either case, the meeting is governed by the agenda and the agenda constitutes the body’s agreed-upon roadmap for the meeting. Each agenda item can be handled by the chair in the following basic format:
**First**, the chair should clearly announce the agenda item number and should clearly state what the agenda item subject is. The chair should then announce the format (which follows) that will be followed in considering the agenda item.

**Second**, following that agenda format, the chair should invite the appropriate person or persons to report on the item, including any recommendation that they might have. The appropriate person or persons may be the chair, a member of the body, a staff person, or a committee chair charged with providing input on the agenda item.

**Third**, the chair should ask members of the body if they have any technical questions of clarification. At this point, members of the body may ask clarifying questions to the person or persons who reported on the item, and that person or persons should be given time to respond.

**Fourth**, the chair should invite public comments, or if appropriate at a formal meeting, should open the public meeting for public input. If numerous members of the public indicate a desire to speak to the subject, the chair may limit the time of public speakers. At the conclusion of the public comments, the chair should announce that public input has concluded (or the public hearing, as the case may be, is closed).

**Fifth**, the chair should invite a motion. The chair should announce the name of the member of the body who makes the motion.

**Sixth**, the chair should determine if any member of the body wishes to second the motion. The chair should announce the name of the member of the body who seconds the motion. It is normally good practice for a motion to require a second before proceeding to ensure that it is not just one member of the body who is interested in a particular approach. However, a second is not an absolute requirement, and the chair can proceed with consideration and vote on a motion even when there is no second. This is a matter left to the discretion of the chair.

**Seventh**, if the motion is made and seconded, the chair should make sure everyone understands the motion. This is done in one of three ways:

1. The chair can ask the maker of the motion to repeat it;
2. The chair can repeat the motion; or
3. The chair can ask the secretary or the clerk of the body to repeat the motion.

**Eighth**, the chair should now invite discussion of the motion by the body. If there is no desired discussion, or after the discussion has ended, the chair should announce that the body will vote on the motion. If there has been no discussion or very brief discussion, then the vote on the motion should proceed immediately and there is no need to repeat the motion. If there has been substantial discussion, then it is normally best to make sure everyone understands the motion by repeating it.

**Ninth**, the chair takes a vote. Simply asking for the “ayes” and then asking for the “nays” normally does this. If members of the body do not vote, then they “abstain.” Unless the rules of the body provide otherwise (or unless a super majority is required as delineated later in these rules), then a simple majority (as defined in law or the rules of the body as delineated later in these rules) determines whether the motion passes or is defeated.

**Tenth**, the chair should announce the result of the vote and what action (if any) the body has taken. In announcing the result, the chair should indicate the names of the members of the body, if any, who voted in the minority on the motion. This announcement might take the following form: “The motion passes by a vote of 3-2, with Smith and Jones dissenting. We have passed the motion requiring a 10-day notice for all future meetings of this body.”

**Motions in General**

Motions are the vehicles for decision making by a body. It is usually best to have a motion before the body prior to commencing discussion of an agenda item. This helps the body focus.

Motions are made in a simple two-step process. First, the chair should recognize the member of the body. Second, the member of the body makes a motion by preceding the member’s desired approach with the words “I move …”

A typical motion might be: “I move that we give a 10-day notice in the future for all our meetings.”

The chair usually initiates the motion in one of three ways:

1. **Inviting the members of the body to make a motion**, for example, “A motion at this time would be in order.”
2. **Suggesting a motion to the members of the body**, “A motion would be in order that we give a 10-day notice in the future for all our meetings.”
3. **Making the motion**. As noted, the chair has every right as a member of the body to make a motion, but should normally do so only if the chair wishes to make a motion on an item but is convinced that no other member of the body is willing to step forward to do so at a particular time.

**The Three Basic Motions**

There are three motions that are the most common and recur often at meetings:

**The basic motion**. The basic motion is the one that puts forward a decision for the body’s consideration. A basic motion might be: “I move that we create a five-member committee to plan and put on our annual fundraiser.”
The motion to amend. If a member wants to change a basic motion that is before the body, they would move to amend it. A motion to amend might be: “I move that we amend the motion to have a 10-member committee.” A motion to amend takes the basic motion that is before the body and seeks to change it in some way.

The substitute motion. If a member wants to completely do away with the basic motion that is before the body, and put a new motion before the body, they would move a substitute motion. A substitute motion might be: “I move a substitute motion that we cancel the annual fundraiser this year.”

“Motions to amend” and “substitute motions” are often confused, but they are quite different, and their effect (if passed) is quite different. A motion to amend seeks to retain the basic motion on the floor, but modify it in some way. A substitute motion seeks to throw out the basic motion on the floor, and substitute a new and different motion for it. The decision as to whether a motion is really a “motion to amend” or a “substitute motion” is left to the chair. So if a member makes what that member calls a “motion to amend,” but the chair determines that it is really a “substitute motion,” then the chair’s designation governs.

A “friendly amendment” is a practical parliamentary tool that is simple, informal, saves time and avoids bogging a meeting down with numerous formal motions. It works in the following way: In the discussion on a pending motion, it may appear that a change to the motion is desirable or may win support for the motion from some members. When that happens, a member who has the floor may simply say, “I want to suggest a friendly amendment to the motion.” The member suggests the friendly amendment, and if the maker and the person who seconded the motion pending on the floor accepts the friendly amendment, that now becomes the pending motion on the floor. If either the maker or the person who seconded rejects the proposed friendly amendment, then the proposer can formally move to amend.

Multiple Motions Before the Body

There can be up to three motions on the floor at the same time. The chair can reject a fourth motion until the chair has dealt with the three that are on the floor and has resolved them. This rule has practical value. More than three motions on the floor at any given time is confusing and unwieldy for almost everyone, including the chair.

When there are two or three motions on the floor (after motions and seconds) at the same time, the vote should proceed first on the last motion that is made. For example, assume the first motion is a basic “motion to have a five-member committee to plan and put on our annual fundraiser.” During the discussion of this motion, a member might make a second motion to “amend the main motion to have a 10-member committee, not a five-member committee to plan and put on our annual fundraiser.” And perhaps, during that discussion, a member makes yet a third motion as a “substitute motion that we not have an annual fundraiser this year.” The proper procedure would be as follows:

First, the chair would deal with the third (the last) motion on the floor, the substitute motion. After discussion and debate, a vote would be taken first on the third motion. If the substitute motion passed, it would be a substitute for the basic motion and would eliminate it. The first motion would be moot, as would the second motion (which sought to amend the first motion), and the action on the agenda item would be completed on the passage by the body of the third motion (the substitute motion). No vote would be taken on the first or second motions.

Second, if the substitute motion failed, the chair would then deal with the second (now the last) motion on the floor, the motion to amend. The discussion and debate would focus strictly on the amendment (should the committee be five or 10 members). If the motion to amend passed, the chair would then move to consider the main motion (the first motion) as amended. If the motion to amend failed, the chair would then move to consider the main motion (the first motion) in its original format, not amended.

Third, the chair would now deal with the first motion that was placed on the floor. The original motion would either be in its original format (five-member committee), or if amended, would be in its amended format (10-member committee). The question on the floor for discussion and decision would be whether a committee should plan and put on the annual fundraiser.

To Debate or Not to Debate

The basic rule of motions is that they are subject to discussion and debate. Accordingly, basic motions, motions to amend, and substitute motions are all eligible, each in their turn, for full discussion before and by the body. The debate can continue as long as members of the body wish to discuss an item, subject to the decision of the chair that it is time to move on and take action.

There are exceptions to the general rule of free and open debate on motions. The exceptions all apply when there is a desire of the body to move on. The following motions are not debatable (that is, when the following motions are made and seconded, the chair must immediately call for a vote of the body without debate on the motion):

Motion to adjourn. This motion, if passed, requires the body to immediately adjourn to its next regularly scheduled meeting. It requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to recess. This motion, if passed, requires the body to immediately take a recess. Normally, the chair determines the length of the recess which may be a few minutes or an hour. It requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to fix the time to adjourn. This motion, if passed, requires the body to adjourn the meeting at the specific time set in the motion. For example, the motion might be: “I move we adjourn this meeting at midnight.” It requires a simple majority vote.
Motion to table. This motion, if passed, requires discussion of the agenda item to be halted and the agenda item to be placed on “hold.” The motion can contain a specific time in which the item can come back to the body. “I move we table this item until our regular meeting in October.” Or the motion can contain no specific time for the return of the item, in which case a motion to take the item off the table and bring it back to the body will have to be taken at a future meeting. A motion to table an item (or to bring it back to the body) requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to limit debate. The most common form of this motion is to say, “I move the previous question” or “I move the question” or “I call the question” or sometimes someone simply shouts out “question.” As a practical matter, when a member calls out one of these phrases, the chair can expedite matters by treating it as a “request” rather than as a formal motion. The chair can simply inquire of the body, “any further discussion?” If no one wishes to have further discussion, then the chair can go right to the pending motion that is on the floor. However, if even one person wishes to discuss the pending motion further, then at that point, the chair should treat the call for the “question” as a formal motion, and proceed to it.

When a member of the body makes such a motion (“I move the previous question”), the member is really saying: “I’ve had enough debate. Let’s get on with the vote.” When such a motion is made, the chair should ask for a second, stop debate, and vote on the motion to limit debate. The motion to limit debate requires a two-thirds vote of the body.

NOTE: A motion to limit debate could include a time limit. For example: “I move we limit debate on this agenda item to 15 minutes.” Even in this format, the motion to limit debate requires a two-thirds vote of the body. A similar motion is a motion to object to consideration of an item. This motion is not debatable, and if passed, precludes the body from even considering an item on the agenda. It also requires a two-thirds vote.

Majority and Super Majority Votes
In a democracy, a simple majority vote determines a question. A tie vote means the motion fails. So in a seven-member body, a vote of 4-3 passes the motion. A vote of 3-3 with one abstention means the motion fails. If one member is absent and the vote is 3-3, the motion still fails.

All motions require a simple majority, but there are a few exceptions. The exceptions come up when the body is taking an action which effectively cuts off the ability of a minority of the body to take an action or discuss an item. These extraordinary motions require a two-thirds majority (a super majority) to pass:

Motion to limit debate. Whether a member says, “I move the previous question,” or “I move the question,” or “I call the question,” or “I move to limit debate,” it all amounts to an attempt to cut off the ability of the minority to discuss an item, and it requires a two-thirds vote to pass.

Motion to close nominations. When choosing officers of the body (such as the chair), nominations are in order either from a nominating committee or from the floor of the body. A motion to close nominations effectively cuts off the right of the minority to nominate officers and it requires a two-thirds vote to pass.

Motion to object to the consideration of a question. Normally, such a motion is unnecessary since the objectionable item can be tabled or defeated straight up. However, when members of a body do not even want an item on the agenda to be considered, then such a motion is in order. It is not debatable, and it requires a two-thirds vote to pass.

Motion to suspend the rules. This motion is debatable, but requires a two-thirds vote to pass. If the body has its own rules of order, conduct or procedure, this motion allows the body to suspend the rules for a particular purpose. For example, the body (a private club) might have a rule prohibiting the attendance at meetings by non-club members. A motion to suspend the rules would be in order to allow a non-club member to attend a meeting of the club on a particular date or on a particular agenda item.

Counting Votes
The matter of counting votes starts simple, but can become complicated.

Usually, it’s pretty easy to determine whether a particular motion passed or whether it was defeated. If a simple majority vote is needed to pass a motion, then one vote more than 50 percent of the body is required. For example, in a five-member body, if the vote is three in favor and two opposed, the motion passes. If it is two in favor and three opposed, the motion is defeated.

If a two-thirds majority vote is needed to pass a motion, then how many affirmative votes are required? The simple rule of thumb is to count the “no” votes and double that count to determine how many “yes” votes are needed to pass a particular motion. For example, in a seven-member body, if two members vote “no” then the “yes” vote of at least four members is required to achieve a two-thirds majority vote to pass the motion.

What about tie votes? In the event of a tie, the motion always fails since an affirmative vote is required to pass any motion. For example, in a five-member body, if the vote is two in favor and two opposed, with one member absent, the motion is defeated.

Vote counting starts to become complicated when members vote “abstain” or in the case of a written ballot, cast a blank (or unreadable) ballot. Do these votes count, and if so, how does one count them? The starting point is always to check the statutes.

In California, for example, for an action of a board of supervisors to be valid and binding, the action must be approved by a majority of the board. (California Government Code Section 25005.) Typically, this means three of the five members of the board must vote affirmatively in favor of the action. A vote of 2-1 would not be sufficient. A vote of 3-0 with two abstentions would be sufficient. In general law cities in
California, as another example, resolutions or orders for the payment of money and all ordinances require a recorded vote of the total members of the city council. (California Government Code Section 36936.) Cities with charters may prescribe their own vote requirements. Local elected officials are always well-advised to consult with their local agency counsel on how state law may affect the vote count.

After consulting state statutes, step number two is to check the rules of the body. If the rules of the body say that you count votes of “those present” then you treat abstentions one way. However, if the rules of the body say that you count the votes of those “present and voting,” then you treat abstentions a different way. And if the rules of the body are silent on the subject, then the general rule of thumb (and default rule) is that you count all votes that are “present and voting.” Accordingly, under the “present and voting” system, you would NOT count abstention votes on the motion. Members who abstain are counted for purposes of determining quorum (they are “present”), but you treat the abstention votes on the motion as if they did not exist (they are not “voting”). On the other hand, if the rules of the body specifically say that you count votes of those “present” then you DO count abstention votes both in establishing the quorum and on the motion. In this event, the abstention votes act just like “no” votes.

**How does this work in practice?**

**Here are a few examples.**

Assume that a five-member city council is voting on a motion that requires a simple majority vote to pass, and assume further that the body has no specific rule on counting votes. Accordingly, the default rule kicks in and we count all votes of members that are “present and voting.” If the vote on the motion is 3-2, the motion passes. If the motion is 2-2 with one abstention, the motion fails.

Assume a five-member city council voting on a motion that requires a two-thirds majority vote to pass, and further assume that the body has no specific rule on counting votes. Again, the default rule applies. If the vote is 3-2, the motion fails for lack of a two-thirds majority. If the vote is 4-1, the motion passes with a clear two-thirds majority. A vote of three “yes,” one “no” and one “abstain” also results in passage of the motion. Once again, the abstention is counted only for the purpose of determining quorum, but on the actual vote on the motion, it is as if the abstention vote never existed — so an effective 3-1 vote is clearly a two-thirds majority vote.

Now, change the scenario slightly. Assume the same five-member city council voting on a motion that requires a two-thirds majority vote to pass, but now assume that the body **DOES** have a specific rule requiring a two-thirds vote of members “present.” Under this specific rule, we must count the members present not only for quorum but also for the motion. In this scenario, any abstention has the same force and effect as if it were a “no” vote. Accordingly, if the votes were three “yes,” one “no” and one “abstain,” then the motion fails. The abstention in this case is treated like a “no” vote and effective vote of 3-2 is not enough to pass two-thirds majority muster.

Now, exactly how does a member cast an “abstention” vote? Any time a member votes “abstain” or says, “I abstain,” that is an abstention. However, if a member votes “present” that is also treated as an abstention (the member is essentially saying, “Count me for purposes of a quorum, but my vote on the issue is abstain.”) In fact, any manifestation of intention not to vote either “yes” or “no” on the pending motion may be treated by the chair as an abstention. If written ballots are cast, a blank or unreadable ballot is counted as an abstention as well.

Can a member vote “absent” or “count me as absent?” Interesting question. The ruling on this is up to the chair. The better approach is for the chair to count this as if the member had left his/her chair and is actually “absent.” That, of course, affects the quorum. However, the chair may also treat this as a vote to abstain, particularly if the person does not actually leave the dais.

**The Motion to Reconsider**

There is a special and unique motion that requires a bit of explanation all by itself: the motion to reconsider. A tenet of parliamentary procedure is finality. After vigorous discussion, debate and a vote, there must be some closure to the issue. And so, after a vote is taken, the matter is deemed closed, subject only to reopening if a proper motion to reconsider is made and passed.

A motion to reconsider requires a majority vote to pass like other garden-variety motions, but there are two special rules that apply only to the motion to reconsider.

First, is the matter of timing. A motion to reconsider must be made at the meeting where the item was first voted upon. A motion to reconsider made at a later time is untimely. (The body, however, can always vote to suspend the rules and, by a two-thirds majority, allow a motion to reconsider to be made at another time.)

Second, a motion to reconsider may be made only by certain members of the body. Accordingly, a motion to reconsider may be made only by a member who voted in the majority on the original motion. If such a member has a change of heart, he or she may make the motion to reconsider (any other member of the body — including a member who voted in the minority on the original motion — may second the motion). If a member who voted in the minority seeks to make the motion to reconsider, it must be ruled out of order. The purpose of this rule is finality. If a member of minority could make a motion to reconsider, then the item could be brought back to the body again and again, which would defeat the purpose of finality.

If the motion to reconsider passes, then the original matter is back before the body, and a new original motion is in order. The matter may be discussed and debated as if it were on the floor for the first time.
Appeal. If the chair makes a ruling that a member of the body disagrees with, that member may appeal the ruling of the chair. If the motion is seconded, and after debate, if it passes by a simple majority vote, then the ruling of the chair is deemed reversed.

Call for orders of the day. This is simply another way of saying, “return to the agenda.” If a member believes that the body has drifted from the agreed-upon agenda, such a call may be made. It does not require a vote, and when the chair discovers that the agenda has not been followed, the chair simply reminds the body to return to the agenda item properly before them. If the chair fails to do so, the chair’s determination may be appealed.

Withdraw a motion. During debate and discussion of a motion, the maker of the motion on the floor, at any time, may interrupt a speaker to withdraw his or her motion from the floor. The motion is immediately deemed withdrawn, although the chair may ask the person who seconded the motion if he or she wishes to make the motion, and any other member may make the motion if properly recognized.

Special Notes About Public Input
The rules outlined above will help make meetings very public-friendly. But in addition, and particularly for the chair, it is wise to remember three special rules that apply to each agenda item:

Rule One: Tell the public what the body will be doing.
Rule Two: Keep the public informed while the body is doing it.
Rule Three: When the body has acted, tell the public what the body did.
RESOLUTION 2006-23

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO ESTABLISHING A POLICY REGARDING EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT AND USE OF PUBLIC RESOURCES

WHEREAS, the City of El Cerrito and the El Cerrito City Council take stewardship over the use of limited public resources seriously; and

WHEREAS, public resources should only be used for travel and reimbursing the expenses of public officials when there is a substantial benefit to the City; and

WHEREAS, the benefits to the City of reimbursing actual and necessary expenses include: 1) the opportunity to discuss the community’s concerns with state and federal officials; 2) participating in regional, state and national organizations whose activities benefit and affect the City; 3) attending educational seminars designed to improve officials’ skills and information levels through continuing education and information sharing with other public officials; and 4) promoting public service and morale by recognizing such service; and

WHEREAS, 1) legislative and other regional, state and federal agency business is frequently conducted over meals; 2) sharing a meal with regional, state and federal officials is frequently the best opportunity for a more extensive, focused and uninterrupted communication about the City’s policy concerns; and 3) each meal expenditure must comply with the limits and reporting requirements of local, state and federal law; and

WHEREAS, this policy provides guidance to elected and appointed officials on the appropriate use and expenditure of City resources, as well as the standards against which those expenditures will be measured; and

WHEREAS, this policy satisfies the requirements of Government Code sections 53232.2 and 53233.3; and

WHEREAS, this policy supplements the definition of actual and necessary expenses for purposes of applicable State laws relating to permissible uses of public resources; and

WHEREAS, this policy also supplements the definition of necessary and reasonable expenses for purposes of federal and state income tax laws.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of El Cerrito adopts the following provisions governing the reimbursement of expenses and the use of City resources for elected and appointed officials.
A. Authorized Expenses

City funds, equipment, supplies (including letterhead), titles, and staff time must only be used for authorized business of the City of El Cerrito. Expenses incurred by public officials in connection with the following types of activities generally constitute authorized expenses, and may be reimbursed by the City as long as the other requirements of this policy and any implementing procedures are met:

1. Serving the needs of the residents, businesses and visitors of the City of El Cerrito;
2. Communicating with constituents in compliance with applicable laws;
3. Communicating with representatives of regional, state and national government on City policy positions;
4. Attending educational seminars designed to improve public officials’ skills, knowledge, and information levels;
5. Participating in regional, state and national organizations whose activities benefit or affect the City’s interests;
6. Recognizing service to the City (for example, thanking a longtime employee with a retirement gift or celebration or award of nominal value and cost);
7. Attending City, community, regional and other events;
8. Gathering facts and information regarding City projects, issues and priorities in other jurisdictions; and
9. Implementing a City-initiated strategy for attracting or retaining businesses to the City.

The reimbursement of an expense in excess of $50 (fifty dollars) for any purpose other than those listed above shall require prior approval by the City Council.

The following expenditures also require prior City Council approval:

1. Payments for international travel; and
2. Expenses which exceed any annual limits established for each office holder.

Examples of personal expenses that the City will not reimburse include, but are not limited to:

1. The personal portion of any trip;
2. Political or charitable contributions;
3. Family expenses, including partner's expenses when accompanying official on City-related business, as well as children- or pet-related expenses;

4. Entertainment expenses, including theater, movies (either in-room or at the theater), recreational events not related to City business (including gym or massage expenses), cultural events not related to City business;

5. Non-mileage personal automobile expenses, including repairs, traffic citations, insurance or gasoline;

6. Personal losses incurred while on City business; and

7. Personal alcohol or bar expenses.

Any questions regarding the propriety of a particular type of expense should be resolved by the City Council before the expense is incurred.

B. Cost Control

To conserve City resources and keep expenses within community standards for public officials, expenditures should adhere to the following guidelines. In the event that expenses are incurred which exceed these guidelines, the cost borne or reimbursed by the City will be limited to the costs that fall within the guidelines, unless such excess amounts have been approved in advance by the City Council. Nothing in this policy will be construed to limit reimbursement of expenses in excess of stated amounts needed in order to accommodate a disability.

C. Transportation

The most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs, the public official's time constraints, and cargo space requirements must be used, using the most direct and time-efficient route. Charges for rental vehicles may be reimbursed under this provision if more than one City official is attending an out of town conference, and it is determined that sharing a rental vehicle is more economical than other forms of transportation. In making such determination, the cost of the rental vehicle, parking and gasoline will be compared to the combined cost of such other forms of transportation. Government and group rates must be used when available. The City Council recognizes and acknowledges that some public officials are part-time volunteers, and that personal, employment and other commitments may impact the economy of available travel arrangements.

1. Airfare. Airfares that are equal or less than those available through the Enhanced Local Government Airfare Program offered through the League of California Cities (www.cacities.org/travel), the California State Association of Counties (http://www.csac.counties.org/default.asp?id=635) and the State of California shall be, in most normal circumstances, presumed to be the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy. The City Council recognizes and acknowledges that such
airfares are not always practicable or available in certain limited circumstances, and finds that higher airfares may be appropriate in individual cases.

2. **Automobile.** Automobile mileage is reimbursed at Internal Revenue Service rates presently in effect (see www.irs.gov). For 2006, the rate is 44.5 cents per mile. These rates are designed to compensate the driver for gasoline, insurance, maintenance, and other expenses associated with operating the vehicle. This amount does not include bridge and road tolls, which are also reimbursable. The Internal Revenue Service rates will not be paid for rental vehicles; only receipted fuel expenses will be reimbursed.

3. **Car Rental.** Rental rates that are equal or less than those available through the State of California's website (http://www.cartravelsmart.com/default.htm) shall be considered the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy.

4. **Taxis/Shuttles.** Taxis or shuttle fares may be reimbursed, including a 15 percent gratuity per fare, when the cost of such fares is equal or less than the cost of car rentals, gasoline and parking combined, or when such transportation is necessary for time-efficiency.

**D. Lodging**

Lodging expenses will be reimbursed or paid for when travel on official City business reasonably requires an overnight stay.

1. **Conferences/Meetings.** If such lodging is in connection with a conference, lodging expenses must not exceed the group rate published by the conference sponsor for the meeting in question if such rates are available at the time of booking. If the group rate is not available, see next section.

2. **Other Lodging.** Travelers must request government lodging rates, when available. A listing of hotels offering government rates in different areas is available at http://www.cartravelsmart.com/lodguideframes.htm. Lodging rates that are equal or less to government rates are presumed to be reasonable and hence reimbursable for purposes of this policy. In the event that government rates are not available at a given time or in a given area, lodging rates that do not exceed the median retail price for lodging for that area listed on websites such as www.hotels.com, www.expedia.com or an equivalent service shall be considered reasonable and hence reimbursable if, given the circumstances of the travel, such comparable rates can be found. In unique circumstances, the City Manager may approve the reimbursement of reasonable lodging costs that exceed the two standards above, if necessary under the particular circumstances.

**E. Meals**

Public officials shall, when available, take meals that are provided as part of a seminar or conference registration fee. Reimbursable meal expenses and associated gratuities shall not
exceed the following rates per person:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such amounts will be annually adjusted without further action by the City Council to reflect changes in the cost of living in accordance with statistics published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index, all urban consumers for the San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose Metropolitan Area. (The annual adjustment will be based on this area whether travel is within the area or not.) The City will not reimburse personal alcohol or bar expenses.

F. Telephone/Fax

Officials will be reimbursed for all actual telephone and fax expenses incurred on City business. Telephone bills should identify which calls were made on City business.

G. Airport and Other Parking Charges

The City will reimburse parking costs based on actual costs or the equivalent of long-term parking rates used for travel exceeding 24-hours.

H. Other

Baggage handling fees and reasonable gratuities will be reimbursed. Expenses for which City officials receive reimbursement from another agency are not reimbursable.

I. Expense Report Content and Submission Deadline

All expense reimbursement requests must be submitted on an expense report form provided by the City. This form shall include the following advisory:

*All expenses reported on this form must comply with the City’s policies relating to expenses and use of public resources. The information submitted on this form is a public record. Penalties for misusing public resources and violating the City’s policies may include loss of reimbursement privileges, restitution, civil and criminal penalties as well as additional income tax liability.*

Expense reports must document that the expense in question met the requirements of this policy.
Except as required sooner by this policy, public officials must submit their expense reports within thirty (30) calendar days of an expense being incurred, accompanied by receipts documenting each expense. Restaurant receipts, in addition to any credit card receipts, are also part of the necessary documentation. The inability to provide such documentation in a timely fashion may result in the expense being borne by the official.

J. Verification of Expense Reports

All expenses are subject to verification that they comply with this policy. The City Council and/or the Director of Finance or his/her designee may request additional documentation or explanation of individual expenditures for which reimbursement is requested by a public official.

K. Reports To the Public

At a subsequent City Council meeting, each public official shall briefly report, orally or in writing, on meetings attended at City expense. If multiple officials attended an event, a joint report or individual report on behalf of all attendees may be made.

* * * * * *

I CERTIFY that at a regular meeting on April 17, 2006, the El Cerrito City Council passed this resolution by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Bridges, Jones, Moore and Abelson
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: Potter

IN WITNESS of this action, I sign this document and affix the corporate seal of the City of El Cerrito on April 18, 2006.

Carol Jean Wilson, City Clerk

Approved:

Janet Abelson, Mayor
RESOLUTION 2012-84

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO
ADOPTING A COMPLIMENTARY TICKET DISTRIBUTION POLICY PURSUANT
TO FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION REGULATION 18944.1

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2011, Fair Political Practices Commission
(“FPPC”) Regulation 18944.1 was amended by the FPPC, and these amendments were
effective as of January 1, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Regulation 18944.1 describes the circumstances in which the
distribution of tickets or passes to a City Official does not result in a gift to the City
Official who accepts such ticket or pass; and

WHEREAS, if a local agency wishes to take advantage of the exception to the gift
rules identified under FPPC Regulation 18944.1, the FPPC requires the legislative body
of the local agency to adopt a written policy governing the distribution of
“complimentary tickets or passes”; and

WHEREAS, the City Council would like to adopt such a policy and take
advantage of the exemptions provided by FPPC Regulation 18944.1.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of El
Cerrito does hereby resolve as follows:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are hereby
incorporated by reference.

Section 2. The City Council hereby adopts the policy regarding the
distribution of complimentary tickets pursuant to the Fair Political Practices Commission
Regulation 18944.1, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A.

I CERTIFY that at a regular meeting on November 20, 2012 the City Council
passed this resolution by the following vote:

AYES:       Councilmembers Abelson, Benassini, Lyman and Mayor Jones
NOES:        None
ABSTAIN:     None
ABSENT:      Councilmember Cheng
IN WITNESS of this action, I sign this document and affix the corporate seal of the City of El Cerrito on November 27, 2012.

Cheryl Morse, City Clerk

APPROVED:

William C. Jones, III, Mayor
Exhibit A

CITY OF EL CERRITO POLICY REGARDING THE DISTRIBUTION
OF COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS PURSUANT TO
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION REGULATION 18944.1

Section 1. Purpose of Policy.

The purpose of this Policy is to establish a fair and equitable process for the distribution
of complimentary tickets or passes provided to the City in compliance with the
requirements of Section 18944.1 of the Fair Political Practices Commission Regulations.
This Policy is subject to all applicable FPPC Regulations and the Political Reform Act, as
they now exist or may hereafter be added or amended. These regulations can be found at
Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations ("FPPC Regulations").

Section 2. Definitions.

Unless otherwise expressly provided herein, words and terms used in this Policy shall
have the same meaning as that ascribed to such words and terms in the California
Political Reform Act of 1974 (Government Code Sections 81000, et seq., as may be
amended from time to time) and FPPC Regulations.

A. "City" means the City of El Cerrito, and any other affiliated agency created or
activated by the City Council, and any departments, boards and commissions thereof.

B. "City Official" means every officer, agent and employee of the City who is
obligated to file an Annual Statement of Economic Interests ("FPPC Form 700") under
state law or the City's current conflict of interest code.

C. "City Venue" means any facility owned, controlled or operated by the City, or
any City department, commission or board.

D. "FPPC" means the California Fair Political Practices Commission.

E. "Family" means spouse, registered domestic partner, children and dependent
children as defined in FPPC Regulation 18943.

F. "Policy" means this Policy Regarding the Distribution of Complimentary Tickets
Pursuant to FPPC Regulation 18944.1.

G. "Ticket" means a "ticket or pass" as that term is defined in FPPC Regulation
18944.1, as amended from time to time, but which currently defines a "ticket or pass" as
admission privileges to a facility, event, show or performance for an entertainment,
amusement, recreational, or similar purpose. If other benefits, such as food, beverages or
other items, are provided to the City Official at the event and such benefits are not
included as part of the admission to the event, those benefits are not covered by this
Policy.
Section 3. Application of Policy.

A. Generally, this Policy applies to the distribution of all Tickets received by the City that provide admission to a facility, event, show, or performance for entertainment, amusement, recreational or similar purpose.

B. This Policy shall be applicable to every officer, agent and employee of the City who is obligated to file a FPPC Form 700 under state law or the City's Conflict of Interest Code.

C. This Policy governs the distribution of complimentary Tickets received by the City that are either:

1. Gratuitously provided to the City by an outside source;
2. Purchased by the City;
3. Acquired by the City as consideration pursuant to the terms of a contract for the use of a City venue; or
4. Acquired and distributed by the City in any other manner.

D. This Policy does not apply to:

1. Any other item of value provided to the City or any City Official, regardless of whether received gratuitously or for which consideration is provided;
2. Tickets provided by sources other than the City;
3. Tickets received by a City Official from the City where both the City Official and the City treat and report the value of the Ticket as income consistent with applicable state and federal income tax laws and the Ticket is reported as income pursuant to the provisions of this Policy; or
4. Tickets provided to public officials directly by third parties (these tickets must be disclosed on the FPPC Form 700).

Section 4. General Provisions.

A. No Right to Tickets: The use of complimentary Tickets is a privilege extended by the City and not the right of any person to which the privilege may from time to time be extended.

B. Limitation on Transfer of Tickets: Tickets distributed to a City Official pursuant to this Policy shall not be transferred to any other person, except to members of the City Official's Family solely for their personal use. If a City Official transfers a Ticket he or she has received from the City to another person, as opposed to returning the Ticket to the City for redistribution, then the value of the Ticket or Tickets he or she transfers shall
constitute a gift to him or her and shall be reportable as provided by the FPPC Regulations.

C. Prohibition Against Sale of or Receiving Reimbursement for Tickets: No person who receives a Ticket pursuant to this Policy shall sell or receive reimbursement for the value of such Ticket.

Section 5. Ticket Administrator.

A. The City Council delegates the authority to the City Manager or his/her designee to be the Ticket Administrator for purposes of implementing the provisions of this Policy.

B. The Ticket Administrator shall have the authority, in his or her sole discretion, to establish procedures for the distribution of Tickets in accordance with this Policy. Such authority includes the power to distribute a Ticket to the City Manager provided that doing so is otherwise consistent with this Policy. All requests for Tickets that fall within the scope of this Policy shall be made in accordance with the procedures established by the Ticket Administrator.

C. The Ticket Administrator shall determine the face value of Tickets distributed by the City for purposes of Sections 6.A. and 6.B. of this Policy.

D. The Ticket Administrator, in his or her sole discretion, may revoke or suspend the Ticket privileges of any person who violates any provision of this Policy or the procedures established by the Ticket Administrator for the distribution of Tickets.

E. For the purpose of implementing this Policy, and completing and posting the FPPC Tickets Provided by Agency Report ("FPPC Form 802"), the Ticket Administrator shall be the "Agency Head."

Section 6. Conditions Under Which Tickets May be Distributed.

A. The distribution of any Ticket by the City to, or at the behest of, a City Official must accomplish a "public purpose", which includes one or more of the following:

   1. Facilitating the performance of a ceremonial role or function by a City Official on behalf of the City at an event, for which the City Official may receive enough Tickets for each member of the City Official’s Family.

   2. Facilitating the attendance of a City Official at an event where the job duties of the City Official require his or her attendance at the event, for which the City Official may receive enough Tickets for each member of the City Official’s family.

   3. Promotion of inter-governmental relations and/or cooperation and coordination of resources with other governmental agencies, including, but not limited to, attendance at an event with or by elected or appointed public officials from other jurisdictions, their staff members and their guests.
4. Economic or business development purposes on behalf of the City.

5. Promotion of City resources and/or facilities available to City residents.

6. Promotion of City-run, sponsored or supported community events, activities or programs.

7. To monitor and evaluate the value of City-run, sponsored or supported community events, activities or programs to the City, including but not limited to evaluation of the venue, quality of performances and compliance with City policies, agreements and other requirements.

8. Promotion and evaluation of events, activities or programs at City venues, including but not limited to evaluation of the venue, quality of performances and compliance with City policies, agreements and other requirements.

9. Promoting, supporting and/or showing appreciation for programs or services rendered by charitable and non-profit organizations benefiting City residents.

10. Promotion of City tourism on a local, state, national or worldwide scale.

11. Business retention or attraction on a local, state, national or worldwide scale.

12. Promotion of City recognition, visibility, and/or profile on a local, state, national or worldwide scale.

13. Encouraging City resident and business support for and attendance at local events.

14. Encouraging participants in City sponsored programs to attend local events.

15. Attracting or rewarding volunteer public service.

16. Encouraging or rewarding significant academic, athletic, or public service achievements by City students, residents or businesses.

17. Attracting and retaining highly qualified City employees.

18. Recognizing or rewarding meritorious service by a City employee.

19. Promoting enhanced City employee performance or morale.

20. As an incident to the above public purposes, allowing for the Family of the City Official to accompany the City Official to events to accomplish any of the purposes listed in this Policy.
Section 7. Tickets Distributed at the Behest of a City Official.

A. Only the following City Officials shall have authority to behest Tickets: City Council Members, the City Manager, and Department Heads.

B. Tickets shall be distributed at the behest of a City Official only for one or more public purposes set forth in Section 6.A. above.

C. If Tickets are distributed at the behest of a City Official, such City Official shall not use one of the Tickets so distributed to attend the event.

Section 8. Other Benefits.

A. The distribution of Tickets pursuant to this Policy shall not constitute a "gift" to the City Official receiving the Ticket, however, other benefits, such as food or beverage or other gifts provided to the City Official that are not part of the admission provided by the complimentary Ticket, will need to be accounted for as gifts.

B. If the City receives complimentary Tickets that are earmarked for particular City Officials, then the Tickets are considered gifts to that particular City Official. If these Tickets are not returned unused to the provider within thirty (30) days of receipt, then the City Official must comply with the applicable FPPC gift limit regulations and reporting regulations.

Section 9. Posting and Disclosure Requirements.

A. The distribution of Tickets pursuant to this Policy shall be documented in a completed FPPC Form 802. Within thirty (30) calendar days of the distribution of a Ticket, the Ticket Administrator shall prepare and certify a FPPC Form 802. The completed FPPC Form 802 must be maintained as a public record, and be forwarded to the FPPC for posting on its website. Such postings shall include the following information (in addition to any other information required by the FPPC):

1. The name of the person receiving the Ticket, except that if the recipient is an organization, the City may post the name, address, description of the organization and number of Tickets provided to the organization in lieu of posting the names of each recipient;

2. A description of the event;

3. The date of the event;

4. The face value of the Ticket;

5. The number of Tickets provided to each person;

6. If the Ticket is distributed at the behest of a City Official, the name of the City Official who made such behest; and
7. A description of the public purpose(s) under which the distribution was made, or alternatively, the City Official is treating the Ticket as income.

B. The City may post the name of the department or other unit of the City and the number of Tickets or passes provided to the department or other unit in lieu of posting the name of the individual employee as required in Section 9.A.1 above.

Section 10. Alternative to Above Policy

A. As an alternative to complying with Sections 4 through 9 of this Policy, a City Official may:

1. Ask that the City report the distribution of the Ticket as income and treat the Ticket(s) as income consistent with applicable federal and state income tax laws;

2. Reimburse the City for the face value of the Ticket; or

3. Report the receipt of the Ticket or pass on the City Official’s FPPC Form 700, if the value of the Ticket is over $50 and the aggregate value of the Ticket from a single source in a calendar year is $410 or less.

Policy adopted by the City Council on ______________, 2012.
CLAIMING THE PERQUISITES OF OFFICE: GIFTS, TRAVEL EXPENSES, HONORARIA

City of El Cerrito
November 2022
I. INTRODUCTION

Both the California Constitution and State law regulate the “perks” that officials may receive through their public service. The California Constitution prohibits the use of public funds for private purposes and also prohibits public officials from receiving free or discounted transportation by transportation companies. The Political Reform Act (“Act”) and the regulations promulgated pursuant to the Act restrict receipt of gifts, travel payments and prohibit receipt of honoraria by public officials and certain employees of local government agencies. In addition, the Act prevents elected officials from sending mailings at public expense. State law also prohibits the use of public resources for personal or political purposes.

II. FREE OR DISCOUNTED TRANSPORTATION BY TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES

The constitutional prohibition on the acceptance of passes or discounts from transportation companies by public officials currently is contained in Article XII, Section 7 of the California Constitution. It provides:

“A transportation company may not grant free passes or discounts to anyone holding an office in this State; and the acceptance of a pass or discount by a public official, other than a Public Utilities Commissioner, shall work a forfeiture of that office. A Public Utilities Commissioner may not hold an official relation to nor have a financial interest in a person or corporation subject to regulation by the commission. (Cal. Const., art. XII, 7.)”

The ban is violated when a transportation company makes a gift of transportation or discounts the price of transportation to a public official. The ban applies to interstate and foreign carriers, as well as domestic carriers, and to transportation received outside of California. This interpretation applies irrespective of whether the interstate carrier in question does business in California and therefore applies to airline carriers or other companies over which the official has no jurisdiction. However, the ban only applies to gifts made by transportation companies. An airline ticket or rail pass provided by the airline or railroad to officials would be covered by the ban. The ban does not apply when a ticket or pass is donated to a charity for a door prize and an official wins the prize.

The prohibition applies to public officials, both elected and non-elected, but does not apply to employees. It can be difficult to distinguish between officials and employees, although the Attorney General’s office has provided guidance. The Attorney General’s office has stated that if a particular individual actually sets or makes policy, he or she is an official, if he or she merely advises policy makers, he or she is probably not an official.

The issue of public versus private business is generally not viewed as relevant to the application of the prohibition. Except for Public Utility Commissioners who are specifically authorized to accept free transportation in connection with the performance of official duties, the prohibition against the acceptance of free passes or discounts for transportation applies equally to acceptance of transportation in connection with one’s official duties as it does in connection with one’s personal business. Although the focus may be somewhat different, interpreters of the
prohibition have concluded that the purpose of guarding against corruption and undue influence from transportation companies can result from the acceptance of free or discounted transportation in either context.

The penalty for violation of the provision is severe, and transportation companies are often not aware of the consequences for public officials. The Constitution specifically provides that an official can be removed from office for accepting a pass or discount from a transportation company. The Attorney General has regularly authorized quo warranto lawsuit to remove offending public officials from duty.

III. GIFT RESTRICTIONS

Public officials may not accept gifts from any single source totaling more than $520 (as of 2022) in a calendar year. A “gift” includes any payment or other benefit conferring a personal benefit for which the public official does not provide goods or services of equal or greater value. (Gov. Code § 82028). A single gift given to both a public official and a member of the official’s family is a gift to the official of the full value of the gift. A rebate or discount not regularly available to members of the public is also considered a gift. A gift has been received or accepted when the official takes actual possession of the gift or exercises direction or control over the gift, including discarding the gift or turning it over to another person.

Gifts aggregating $520 or more could disqualify the official with respect to a decision affecting the party who made the gift. Gifts aggregating $50 or more must be disclosed on a Form 700.

Note: An agency’s conflict of interest code may require certain categories of employees to disclose specific sources of gifts which then become subject to the $520 gift limit.

A. EXCEPTIONS TO GIFT RESTRICTIONS

The following gifts are not subject to gift limits and are not required to be disclosed:

1. Gifts returned unused or for which the donor is reimbursed.

2. Gifts donated unused to a 501(c)(3) non-profit, tax-exempt organization or another government agency within 30 days of receipt (without claiming a deduction for tax purposes).

3. Gifts from a family member, defined to include those individuals listed in Government Code Section 82028(b)(3) and 2 Cal Code Regs § 18942(a)(3), unless the family member is an intermediary for a third party who is the true source of the gift.

4. Home hospitality, as defined by 2 Cal Code Regs § 18942.2, provided to an official by an individual in the individual’s home with the individual is present, unless the cost of hospitality is paid or reimbursed by another person, the cost of the hospitality is deducted on any person’s government tax return, or there is an understanding between the individual extending
the hospitality and another person that any amount of compensation the individual receives from that person include a portion to be utilized to provide gifts of hospitality in the individuals home.

5. Gifts approximately equal in value exchanged between the official and another individual, who is not a lobbyist registered to lobby the official’s agency, on holidays, birthdays, or similar occasions, including reciprocal exchanges, to the extent that the value of the benefits received is not substantially disproportionate and no single payment exceeds $520.

6. Informational material provided to assist the official in the performance of official duties, including books, reports, periodicals, videotapes, or free or discounted admission to informational conferences or seminars. Informational material may also include scale models, pictorial representations, and maps. However, if the market value of an item is more than $520, the public official has the burden of establishing that the item is informational, and not a gift.

7. A bequest or inheritance.

8. Campaign contributions, although these must be reported pursuant to the campaign disclosure provisions of the Act.

9. A personalized plaque or trophy with a commercial value less than $250.

10. Two tickets from event sponsors, candidates or campaign committees for fundraisers for campaign committees, other candidates or 501(c)(3) non-profit, tax-exempt organizations. Additional tickets must be disclosed at face value minus stated donation portion of the tickets.

11. Gifts to members of the public official’s family unless the official receives a direct benefit from the gift or exercises discretion and control over the use or disposition of the gift.

12. Gifts to the official’s agency, which confer a personal benefit on a public official will be considered a gift to the agency provided that the conditions in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18944 have been met.

13. Tickets or passes provided to an official by the official’s agency, provided that the requirements contained in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18944.1 have been complied with.

14. Food, shelter, or similar assistance received from a governmental agency or 501(c)(3) non-profit, tax-exempt charity. These items must be available to the general public in connection with a disaster relief program.

15. Leave credits, including vacation, sick leave, or compensatory time off, donated to the official in accordance with an emergency leave program.
established by the official’s employer and available to all employees in the same job classification or position.

16. A ticket or pass provided to an official and one guest of the official for his or her admission to a facility, event, show, or performance for an entertainment, amusement recreational, or similar purpose at which the official performs as ceremonial role on behalf of his or her agency, as defined in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18942.3, so long as the official’s agency complies with the posting requirements set forth in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18944.1.

17. A prize or award received in a manner not related to the official’s status in a contest or competition. However, a prize or award that is not reported as a gift must be reported as income, unless the prize or award is received as a winning from the California State Lottery.

18. Benefits received as a guest attending a wedding or civil union as long as the benefits are substantially the same as the benefits received by other guests attending the event.

19. Bereavement offerings typically provided in memory of and concurrent with the passing of a spouse, parent, child, or sibling other relative of the official.

20. “Acts of Neighborliness,” including a service performed, loan of an item, assistance with a repair or similar acts or ordinary assistance consistent with polite behavior in a civilized society.

21. Personal benefits commonly exchanged between people on a date in a dating relationship, unless the exceptions provided in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18942(a)(18)(D) apply.

22. Payments provided to an official, or an official’s family member, by an individual to offset family medical or living expenses that the official can no longer meet with private assistance because of an accident, illness, employment loss, death in the family, other unexpected calamity; or to defray expenses associated with humanitarian efforts such as the adoption of an orphaned child, so long as the conditions provided in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18942(a)(18)(B) are met, and the exceptions contained in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18942(a)(18)(D) do not apply.

23. A payment provided to an official by an individual with whom the official has a long term, close personal friendship unrelated to the official’s position with the agency, unless the individual providing the benefit to the official is listed in 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18942(a)(18)(D).

24. Any other payment that would otherwise meet the definition of a gift, where the payment is made by an individual who is not a lobbyist.
registered to lobby the official’s agency, where it is clear that the gift was made because of an existing personal or business relationship unrelated to the official’s position and there is no evidence whatsoever at the time the gift is made that the official make or participates in the type of governmental decisions that may have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect on the individual who would otherwise be the source of the gift.

The following exceptions are not subject to dollar limits, but may still be subject to reporting requirements, and may require disqualification:

1. Transportation within California and any necessary lodging and subsistence provided directly in connection with the speech, panel, seminar, or similar service, are also exempt.

2. Wedding gifts.

**Gift to a Public Agency.** A gift to a public agency which confers a personal benefit on a public official will be considered a gift to the agency, and not count against the $520 gift limit, if all of the following requirements are met:

1. Agency Controls Use of the Gift. The agency head or his or her designee controls and determines the use of the gift by the agency and which official or employee will benefit. The donor may identify a purpose for the gift, but the donor may not designate by name, title, classification or otherwise the official or type of official who will use the gift. The agency head or designee who controls the use of the gift may not select himself or herself as the individual who will use the gift.

2. Official Agency Business. The gift must be used for official agency business.

3. Reported on Form 801. Within 30 days after the use of the gift, the agency must report the gift on Form 801. That form, among other things, indicates who gave the gift, the amount of the gift, and how the gift was used. The form is a public record and must be posted on the agency’s web site. (If the agency has no web site, the form must be provided to the FPPC and posted on the FPPC’s website.) A log of these forms must be kept under both the name of the agency and the name of the official benefiting. That log and the forms are to be kept for a period of 4 years. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18944(c).)

This exception does not apply to the following gifts:

1. A gift of travel for a state or local elected official as defined in Government Code §82020, or any official specified in Government Code §87200. This includes costs of transportation, meals or lodging.
2. A gift of travel that exceeds any agency-approved reimbursement rates for travel or, if the agency does not have a standard or policy for reimbursement, any State or Federal reimbursement rate limits for travel.

3. A gift of travel that the agency head has not pre-approved in writing in advance of the date of the trip.

4. Passes or tickets as described in 2 CCR §18944.1. (2 Cal. Code Regs.§ 18944(a).)

A grant, reimbursement, or funding received by a government agency from the Federal government for education, training or other inter-agency programs, will not be considered a gift to the public official receiving the benefit. (2 Cal. Code Regs. § 18950(c)(2). (Additional information is also available at the FPPC’s website at: http://www.fppc.ca.gov/index.html?id=512)

**Public Agency Provided Tickets or Passes.** A ticket or pass distributed to a public official by a public agency will meet the burden under Government Code Section 82028 that equal or greater value has been provided in exchange for the ticket or pass, if the official reimburses the agency for the ticket, or if all of the following requirements are met:

1. For a ticket or pass that the agency receives from an outside source:
   a. The ticket or pass must not be earmarked by the outside source for use by the agency official who uses the ticket or pass;
   b. The agency must determine, in its sole discretion, who may use the ticket or pass;
   c. The distribution of the ticket or pass must be made in accordance with a policy adopted by the agency as further described below.

2. For a ticket or pass the agency obtains (i) pursuant to the terms of a contract for use of public property, (ii) because the agency controls the event, or (iii) by purchase at fair market value, the distribution of the ticket or pass shall be made in accordance with a policy adopted by the agency as described below.

The distribution of a ticket or pass by a public agency to or at the behest of any agency official must be made pursuant to a written agency ticket distribution policy, which has been adopted by the legislative body and contains all of the following:

1. A provision setting forth the public purposes of the agency for which the tickets or passes may be distributed.

2. A provision requiring that the distribution of any ticket or pass to, or at the behest of, an agency official accomplish a stated public purpose of the agency.
3. A provision prohibiting the transfer of any ticket received by an agency official pursuant to the distribution policy except to members of the official’s immediate family or no more than one guest solely for their attendance at the event.

A ticket or pass distributed in accordance with the above, must be reported by the agency on a Form 802 in accordance with the requirements of 2 Cal. Code Regs. 18944. The Form 802 must be maintained as a public record, be subject to inspect and copying, and be forwarded to the Commission for posting on its website.

A ticket or pass is not subject to this regulation, if the official treats the ticket or pass as income consistent with applicable state and federal income tax laws and the agency reports the distribution of the ticket or pass as income to official on a Form 802.

IV. GIFTS OF TRAVEL

Certain travel payments may be subject to gift limit restrictions and/or may be reportable. Travel payments include payments, advances, or reimbursements for travel, including actual transportation as well as related lodging and subsistence.

A. The following categories of travel payments are not subject to any limit and are not reportable.

1. Travel payments provided by the official’s government agency or by any State, local, or Federal government agency which would be considered income and not a gift.

2. Reimbursements for travel expenses provided by a 501(c)(3) non-profit, tax-exempt entity for which the official provides equal or greater consideration.

3. Travel payments provided directly in connection with campaign activities. Note: Such payments must be reported in accordance with the campaign disclosure provisions of the Act.

4. Travel payments excluded from the definition of “gift” as described above.

B. The following travel payments are not subject to the gift limit, but may be reportable:

1. Travel which is reasonably necessary in connection with a bona fide business, trade, or profession, and which satisfies the criteria for federal income tax deductions for business expenses.

2. Where the public official is provided with travel payments in connection with an event at which the official gives a speech, participates on a panel or seminar or similar activity, the following travel payments are exempt:
a. Transportation provided to the recipient directly for an event in California.

b. Lodging, meals and beverages provided directly to the recipient. Lodging, meals and beverages are limited to those provided on the day before, the day of, and the day after the activity.

c. Free admission, refreshments, and similar non-cash items.

3. Travel not in connection with giving a speech, participating on a panel, a seminar, or similar activity, but which is reasonably related to either a legislative/governmental purpose or an issue of State, national, or international public policy and which is provided by one of the following:

   a. A government, governmental agency, foreign government, or government authority;

   b. A bona fide educational institution;

   c. A 501(c)(3) non-profit tax-exempt organization; or

   d. A foreign organization that substantially satisfies the 501(c)(3) requirements for tax-exempt status.

V. HONORARIA BAN

Generally, public officials may not accept honoraria payments. An “honorarium” is any payment for any speech given, article published, or attendance at any conference, convention, meeting, social event meal, etc. A “speech” given includes a public address, oration, or other form of oral presentation, including participation in a panel, seminar, or debate. “Article published” means a nonfiction written work written in connection with any activity other than the practice of a bona fide business, trade, or profession, and that is published in a periodical, journal, newspaper, newsletter, magazine, pamphlet, or similar publication. “Attendance” means being present during, making an appearance at, or serving as a host or master of ceremonies for any conference, convention, meeting, social event, meal, or the like.

A. EXCEPTIONS NOT REPORTABLE

The following payments are not prohibited and are not required to be disclosed on a Form 700:

1. An honorarium that the official returns to the donor within 30 days.

2. An honorarium which the official delivers to his or her government agency within 30 days for donation to the agency’s general fund, and for which the official does not claim a deduction for income tax purposes.

3. A payment received from a family member.
4. An honorarium made directly to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, non-profit organization. However, the official may not make the donation a condition for the speech, article, or attendance. Second, the official may not claim the donation as a deduction for income tax purposes. Third, the official may not be identified to the non-profit organization in connection with the donation. Finally, the donation may have no reasonably foreseeable financial effect on the official or the official’s immediate family.

5. Campaign contributions. Note: Must be reported in accordance with the campaign disclosure provisions of the Act and may be subject to other limitations imposed by the Act.

6. Personalized plaques and trophies with a commercial value less than $250.

7. Transportation within California, and any necessary lodging and subsistence provided directly in connection with an official giving a speech, participating in a panel or seminar, or providing a similar service.

B. EXCEPTIONS WHICH MAY BE REPORTABLE

While the following payments are not considered “honoraria,” they may be reportable:

1. Payments received for a performance (comedy routine, dramatic acting, singing engagement etc.) and payments received for the publication of books, plays, or screenplays. These payments are reportable as income.

2. Income earned for personal services if the services are typically provided in connection with the recipient’s business or profession. Earned income must be reported.

3. Free admission, food, beverages, and other non-cash nominal benefits provided at a conference, convention, meeting, or social event, whether or not the recipient participates. These items may be reportable as gifts and thus subject to the gift limit.

4. Certain payments for transportation, lodging, and subsistence, although not considered honoraria, may be reportable and subject to the gift limit.

VI. PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF PUBLIC RESOURCES FOR PERSONAL OR POLITICAL PURPOSES

Local officials and employees may not use public resources for personal purposes, including political activity. (See Stanson v. Mott, 17 Cal.3d 206 (1970); Penal Code § 424; Gov. Code § 8314.) The term “public funds” includes money as well as equipment, supplies, compensated staff time, and use of telephone, computers and fax machines. For example, where a city commissioner used official government discounts to buy items for him or herself and others, he or she misused public funds, even though his or her personal funds paid for the items.
If the misuse of public funds is more than incidental or minimal, it may be prosecuted as a felony crime and violators may be barred from holding office. (Pen. Code §424.)

Local agencies are also prohibited from expending any funds to support or oppose a ballot measure, as well as the election or defeat of a candidate, by the voters. (Gov. Code § 54964.) However, State law does not prohibit the expenditure of public funds to provide information to the public about the possible effects of a ballot measure on the activities, operations, or policies of a city, as long as the information constitutes an accurate fair and impartial presentation of the relevant facts to aid the voters in reaching an informed judgment.

VII. MASS MAILING RESTRICTIONS

Section 89001 of the Political Reform Act provides that “[n]o newsletter or other mass mailing shall be sent at public expense.” Previously, implementing regulations adopted by the Fair Political Practices Commission (“FPPC”) had further defined mass mailing restrictions, including specific criteria for determining which mailings are prohibited or allowable. In 2017, Senate Bill 45 codified the FPPC’s mass mailing regulations into the Political Reform Act itself. The underlying purpose of these restrictions is to preclude elected officials from using publicly funded communications for campaign purposes.

Under Section 89002(a) of the Political Reform Act, prohibited mass mailings are items which meet all of the following elements:

1. The item is tangible (such as a written newsletter or brochure, but not an e-communication) and is delivered to a recipient’s residence, P.O. box, or place of employment; and

2. The item features an elected officer affiliated with the agency (such as a photo, signature or other manner singling out the officer), or the item includes a reference to an elected officer affiliated with the agency and the item is prepared or sent in cooperation with the elected officer; and

3. Any distribution costs are paid for with public moneys, or if public funds are used for design, production, and/or printing in excess of $50, or printing is done with the intent of sending the item other than as permitted by the Act; and

4. More than 200 substantially similar items are sent in a calendar month, excluding any item sent in response to an unsolicited request.

Mass mailings that satisfy all of the above are prohibited, unless an exception applies.

Section 89002(b) includes many exceptions to the prohibition against mass mailing:

1. Any item in which the elected official’s name appears only in the letterhead or the envelope of the agency sending the mailing, or in a roster listing containing the names of all elected officials of the agency.

2. A press release sent to members of the media.
3. Any item sent in the normal course of business from one governmental entity or official to another governmental entity or official.

4. Any intra-agency communication sent in the normal course of business to employees, officials, deputies, and other staff.

5. Any item sent in connection with the payment or collection of funds by the agency sending the mailing, including tax bills, checks, and similar documents, in any instance where use of the elected official’s name, office, title, or signature is necessary to the payment or collection of the funds.

6. Any item sent by an agency responsible for administering a government program, to persons subject to that program, in any instance where the mailing of such item is essential to the functioning of the program.

7. Any legal notice or other item sent as required by law, court order, or order adopted by an administrative agency pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, and in which use of the elected official’s name, office, title, or signature is necessary in the notice or other mailing.

8. A telephone directory, organization chart, or similar listing or roster which includes the names of elected officials as well as other individuals in the agency sending the mailing.

9. An announcement sent to an elected official’s constituents concerning a public meeting which is directly related to the elected official’s incumbent governmental duties, which is to be held by the elected official, and which the elected official intends to attend or an announcement of any official agency event or events for which the agency is providing the use of its facilities or staff or other financial support.

10. An agenda or other writing that is required to be made available pursuant to the Brown Act.

11. A business card that does not contain the elected official’s photograph or more than one mention of the elected official’s name.

Senate Bill 45 also adopted a new prohibition on sending certain mass mailings in the days leading up to an election. Specifically, section 89003 prohibits the following three categories of otherwise permissible mass mailings if they are sent “within the 60 days preceding an election by or on behalf of a candidate whose name will appear on the ballot at that election.”

1. Any item in which the elected official’s name appears only in the letterhead or the envelope of the agency sending the mailing, or in a roster listing containing the names of all elected officials of the agency.
2. An announcement sent to an elected official’s constituents concerning a public meeting which is directly related to the elected official’s incumbent governmental duties, which is to be held by the elected official, and which the elected official intends to attend or an announcement of any official agency event or events for which the agency is providing the use of its facilities or staff or other financial support.

3. A business card that does not contain the elected official’s photograph or more than one mention of the elected official’s name.

VIII. GIFTS OF PUBLIC FUNDS

The California Constitution prohibits a legislative body from approving a gift of public funds to a private person or group. An expenditure is a “gift” if it does not serve a substantial public purpose. What constitutes a “public purpose” is left to the discretion of the agency’s board. A court reviewing a challenged expenditure should uphold the board’s decision as long as the board had a reasonable basis for concluding that the expenditure served a substantial public purpose. The mere fact the expenditure also benefits a private party does not necessarily mean that the expenditure is not also serving a substantial public purpose.

Neither the Legislature nor the courts have provided a bright line definition of what constitutes a “substantial public purpose.” However, it is clear that an expenditure made solely on moral grounds does not serve a substantial public purpose. Further, if the expenditure does not provide the agency making the expenditure with a direct, substantial benefit, the expenditure would not serve substantial public purpose. In approving an expenditure that may potentially raise a gift of public funds issue, a board can help its legal position by adopting a resolution with findings that set forth its basis for concluding the expenditure serves substantial public purpose.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Cal Cities thanks the following individuals for their work on this publication:

2022-2023

**California Public Records Act Committee**

- **Donald A. Larkin**, Committee Chair  
  City Attorney, Morgan Hill
- **Alexandra V. Atencio**  
  Hanson Bridgett
- **Elizabeth Calciano**  
  Assistant City Attorney, Chino Hills  
  Hensley Law Group
- **Stephanie Duck**  
  Deputy City Attorney, Santa Cruz  
  Atchison, Barisone & Condotti
- **Diana Fazely**  
  Senior Deputy City Attorney, Mountain View
- **Jolie Houston**  
  Assistant City Attorney, Gilroy  
  Berliner Cohen
- **Lisa Kurihara**  
  Assistant City Attorney, Burbank
- **Karen Li**  
  Chief Deputy City Attorney, San Diego
- **Nicolas Papajohn**  
  Deputy City Attorney, La Cañada Flintridge  
  Aleshire & Wynder
- **Manu Pradhan**  
  Deputy City Attorney, San Francisco
- **Veronica Ramirez**  
  City Attorney, Redwood City

**Kane Thuyen**  
Senior Assistant City Attorney, Burbank

**Kelly Trujillo**  
Assistant City Attorney, Napa

**Gabrielle Whelan**  
Town Attorney, Los Gatos

**Eric Danly**  
1st Vice President, City Attorneys’ Department  
City Attorney, Petaluma

**League of California Cities’ Staff**

- Corrie Manning, General Counsel
- Harveen Gill, Assistant General Counsel
- Alison Leary, Senior Deputy General Counsel
- Janet Leonard, Executive Assistant, Legal Services

This publication is provided for general information only and is not offered or intended as legal advice. Readers should seek the advice of an attorney when confronted with legal issues and attorneys should perform an independent evaluation of the issues raised in these materials.

Copyright © 2022

League of California Cities

All rights reserved. This publication, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without the permission of Cal Cities.
# Contents

## Chapter 1 – Introduction and Overview

- **Contents**
  - **Chapter 1 – Introduction and Overview**
  - **Origins of the Public Records Act**
  - **2023 Revisions to the Public Records Act**
  - **Fundamental Right of Access to Government Information**
  - **Exemptions from Disclosure — Protecting the Public’s Fundamental Right of Privacy and Need for Efficient and Effective Government**
  - **Achieving Balance**
  - **Incorporation of the PRA into the California Constitution**
  - **Proposition 59**
  - **Proposition 42**
  - **Expanded Access to Local Government Information**
  - **Equal Access to Government Records**
  - **Enforced Access to Public Records**
  - **The PRA at the Crux of Democratic Government in California**

## Chapter 2 – The Basics

- **Contents**
  - **Chapter 2 – The Basics**
  - **What Are Public Records?**
  - **Writings**
  - **Information Relating to the Conduct of Public Business**
  - **Prepared, Owned, Used, or Retained**
  - **Regardless of Physical Form or Characteristics**
  - **Metadata**
  - **Agency-Developed Software**
  - **Computer Mapping (GIS) Systems**
  - **Specifically Identified Records**
  - **What Agencies are Covered?**
  - **Who Can Request Records?**
Chapter 3 – Responding to a Public Records Request ......................................................... 18

LOCAL AGENCY’S DUTY TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC RECORD REQUESTS ........................................... 18

TYPES OF REQUESTS — RIGHT TO INSPECT OR COPY PUBLIC RECORDS .................................................. 18
  Right to Inspect Public Records ......................................................................................... 19
  Right to Copy Public Records ......................................................................................... 20

FORM OF THE REQUEST .............................................................................................................. 20

CONTENT OF THE REQUEST ........................................................................................................ 21

TIMING OF THE RESPONSE ........................................................................................................... 22
  Inspection of Public Records ............................................................................................... 22
  Copies of Public Records ..................................................................................................... 22
  Extending the Response Times for Copies of Public Records .............................................. 23

TIMING OF DISCLOSURE .................................................................................................................. 24

ASSISTING THE REQUESTER .......................................................................................................... 24

LOCATING RECORDS ...................................................................................................................... 24

TYPES OF RESPONSES .................................................................................................................. 25

REDACTING RECORDS ..................................................................................................................... 26

NO DUTY TO CREATE A RECORD OR A PRIVILEGE LOG ................................................................. 26

FEES .................................................................................................................................................. 27

WAIVER ............................................................................................................................................ 28

Chapter 4 – Specific Document Types, Categories, and Exemptions from Disclosure ............................................. 29

OVERVIEW OF EXEMPTIONS ........................................................................................................... 29

TYPES OF RECORDS AND SPECIFIC EXEMPTIONS .................................................................... 30
  Architectural and Official Building Plans ............................................................................. 30
  Attorney-Client Communications and Attorney Work Product ............................................. 31
    Attorney-Client Privilege ..................................................................................................... 31
    Attorney Work Product ....................................................................................................... 32
  Common Interest Doctrine ..................................................................................................... 32
  Attorney Bills and Retainer Agreements .............................................................................. 33
  CEQA Proceedings .................................................................................................................. 33
  Code Enforcement Records .................................................................................................... 34
  Deliberative Process Privilege ............................................................................................... 34
  Drafts ......................................................................................................................................... 35
  Elections ..................................................................................................................................... 36
    Voter Registration Information .............................................................................................. 36
    Initiative, Recall, and Referendum Petitions ........................................................................ 37
Identity of Informants .................................................................................................................. 37
Information Technology Systems Security Records .................................................................... 38
Law Enforcement Records .......................................................................................................... 38
    Overview ................................................................................................................................. 38
    Exempt Records .................................................................................................................... 39
    Information that Must be Disclosed ....................................................................................... 40
    Disclosure to Victims, Authorized Representatives, and Insurance Carriers ......................... 40
    Information Regarding Arrestees ........................................................................................... 41
    Complaints or Requests for Assistance ................................................................................... 42
    Requests for Journalistic or Scholarly Purposes ..................................................................... 42
    Video or Audio Recordings that Relate to Critical incidents ................................................... 43
    Coroner Photographs or Video ............................................................................................... 43
    Automated License Plate Readers Data .................................................................................... 44
    Mental Health Detention Information ...................................................................................... 44
    Elder Abuse Records ............................................................................................................. 44
    Juvenile Records .................................................................................................................... 44
    Child Abuse Reports .............................................................................................................. 45
Library Patron Use Records .......................................................................................................... 45
Library Circulation Records ......................................................................................................... 45
Licensee Financial Information ..................................................................................................... 46
Medical Records ........................................................................................................................ 46
    Health Data and Advisory Council Consolidation Act ............................................................. 46
    Physician/Patient Privilege ..................................................................................................... 47
    Confidentiality of Medical Information Act .......................................................................... 47
    Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act .............................................................. 47
    Workers’ Compensation Benefits .......................................................................................... 48
Official Information Privilege ........................................................................................................ 48
Pending Litigation or Claims .......................................................................................................... 49
Personal Contact Information ....................................................................................................... 51
Posting Personal Contact Information of Elected/Appointed Officials on the Internet ................. 52
Personnel Records ....................................................................................................................... 52
    Peace Officer Personnel Records ......................................................................................... 53
    Employment Contracts, Employee Salaries, & Pension Benefits ......................................... 57
    Contractor Payroll Records ..................................................................................................... 58
    Test Questions and Other Examination Data ......................................................................... 59
Public Contracting Documents ..................................................................................................... 59
Real Estate Appraisals and Engineering Evaluations .................................................................... 60
Recipients of Public Assistance ................................................................................................... 60
Taxpayer Information .................................................................................................................. 61
Trade Secrets and Other Proprietary Information ........................................................................ 61
Utility Customer Information ...................................................................................................... 62

PUBLIC INTEREST EXEMPTION .................................................................................................. 63
Chapter 5 – Judicial Review and Remedies

OVERVIEW

THE TRIAL COURT PROCESS
Timing
Discovery
Burden of Proof
In Camera Review
Decision and Order

REVERSE PRA LITIGATION

APPELLATE REVIEW
Petition for Review
Timing
Requesting a Stay
Scope and Standard of Review
Appeal of Other Decisions under the PRA

ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS
Eligibility to Recover Attorneys’ Fees

Chapter 6 – Records Management

PUBLIC MEETING RECORDS

MAINTAINING ELECTRONIC RECORDS
Metadata
Computer Software
Computer Mapping (GIS) Systems
Public Contracting Records

ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY

RECORD RETENTION AND DESTRUCTION LAWS
Records Covered by the Records Retention Laws

Appendix 1
FREQUENTLY REQUESTED INFORMATION AND RECORDS

Appendix 2
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION’S DISPOSITION TABLE

Appendix 3
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION’S DERIVATION TABLE
Chapter 1

Introduction and Overview

Origins of the Public Records Act
The California Public Records Act (the PRA) was enacted in 1968 to: (1) safeguard the accountability of government to the public; (2) promote maximum disclosure of the conduct of governmental operations; and (3) explicitly acknowledge the principle that secrecy is antithetical to a democratic system of “government of the people, by the people and for the people.”¹ The PRA was enacted against a background of legislative impatience with secrecy in government and was modeled on the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) enacted a year earlier.² When the PRA was enacted, the Legislature had been attempting to formulate a workable means of minimizing secrecy in government. The resulting legislation replaced a confusing mass of statutes and court decisions relating to disclosure of government records.³ The PRA was the culmination of a 15-year effort by the Legislature to create a comprehensive general public records law.

2023 Revisions to the Public Records Act
In 2021, the legislature enacted the CPRA Recodification Act (AB 473). This Act, effective Jan. 1, 2023, renumbered and reorganized the PRA in a new Division 614 of the Government Code, beginning at section 7920.005. Nothing in AB 473 was “intended to substantially change the law relating to inspection of public records.”⁴ The changes were intended to be “entirely nonsubstantive in effect. Every provision of this division and every other provision of [AB 473], shall be interpreted consistent with the nonsubstantive intent of the act.”⁵

³ San Gabriel Tribune v. Superior Court, supra, 143 Cal.App.3d at p. 772; American Civil Liberties Union Foundation v. Deukmejian, supra, 32 Cal.3d at p. 447.
⁴ Gov. Code, § 7920.100.
⁵ Ibid.
Case law interpreting the prior version of the PRA applies to new provisions that restate and continue the previously existing provisions.⁶ AB 473 is “not intended to, and does not, reflect any assessment of any judicial decision interpreting any provision affected by [AB 473].”⁷

**Fundamental Right of Access to Government Information**

The PRA is an indispensable component of California’s commitment to open government. The PRA expressly provides that “access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state.”⁸ The purpose is to give the public access to information that enables them to monitor the functioning of their government.⁹ The concept that access to information is a fundamental right is not new to United States jurisprudence. Two hundred years ago James Madison observed “[k]nowledge will forever govern ignorance and a people who mean to be their own governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or tragedy or perhaps both.”¹⁰

The PRA provides for two different rights of access. One is a right to inspect public records: “Public records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as hereafter provided.”¹¹ The other is a right to prompt availability of copies of public records:

Except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, each state or local agency, upon a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, shall make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, or a statutory fee if applicable. Upon request, an exact copy shall be provided unless impracticable to do so.¹²

Agency records policies and practices must satisfy both types of public records access — by permitting inspection and by providing copies of public records — that the PRA guarantees.

**Exemptions from Disclosure — Protecting the Public’s Fundamental Right of Privacy and Need for Efficient and Effective Government**

The PRA’s fundamental precept is that governmental records shall be disclosed to the public, upon request, unless there is a legal basis not to do so.¹³ The right of access to public records under the PRA is not unlimited; it does not extend to records that are exempt from disclosure. Express legal authority is required to justify denial of access to public records.

---

6 Gov. Code, § 7920.110, subd. (a).
7 Gov. Code, § 7920.110, subd. (c).
8 Gov. Code, § 7921.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6250).
9 CBS, Inc. v. Block, supra, 42 Cal.3d at p. 651; Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1325, 1350.
11 Gov. Code, § 7922.525, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (a)).
12 Gov. Code, § 7922.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (b)).
13 Ibid.
**PRACTICE TIP:**

There is no general exemption authorizing non-disclosure of government records on the basis the disclosure could be inconvenient or even potentially embarrassing to a local agency or its officials. Disclosure of such records is one of the primary purposes of the PRA.

The PRA itself currently contains numerous exemptions from disclosure.\(^\text{14}\) Despite the Legislature’s goal of accumulating all of the exemptions from disclosure in one place, there are also numerous laws outside the PRA that create exemptions from disclosure. The PRA lists other laws that exempt particular types of government records from disclosure.\(^\text{15}\)

The exemptions from disclosure contained in the PRA and other laws reflect two recurring interests. Many exemptions are intended to protect privacy rights.\(^\text{16}\) Many other exemptions are based on the recognition that, in addition to the need for the public to know what its government is doing, there is a need for the government to perform its assigned functions in a reasonably efficient and effective manner, and to operate on a reasonably level playing field in dealing with private interests.\(^\text{17}\)

**Achieving Balance**

The Legislature in enacting the PRA struck a balance among competing, yet fundamental interests: government transparency, privacy rights, and government effectiveness. The legislative findings declare access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in the state and the Legislature is “mindful of the right of individuals to privacy.”\(^\text{18}\) “In the spirit of this declaration, judicial decisions interpreting the [PRA] seek to balance the public right to access to information, the government’s need, or lack of need, to preserve confidentiality, and the individual’s right to privacy.”\(^\text{19}\)

Approximately half of the current exemptions from disclosure contained in the PRA appear intended primarily to protect privacy interests.\(^\text{20}\) A significant number of the exemptions appear intended primarily to support effective

---

\(^\text{14}\) Gov. Code, § 7921.000 *et. seq.* (formerly Gov. Code, § 6250 *et. seq.*). There are currently over 75 exemptions.

\(^\text{15}\) Gov. Code, § 7930.000 *et. seq.* (formerly Gov. Code, § 6275 *et. seq.*).

\(^\text{16}\) See, e.g., “Personnel Records,” p. 52.

\(^\text{17}\) See, e.g., “Attorney Client Communications and Attorney Work Product,” p. 31.

\(^\text{18}\) Gov. Code, § 7920.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6250); Cal Const., art. I, § 3(b)(3).

\(^\text{19}\) *American Civil Liberties Union Foundation v. Deukmejian*, supra, 32 Cal.3d at p. 447.

\(^\text{20}\) See e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 7926.300 (formerly 6253.2); 7924.100-7924.110 (formerly 6253.5); 7924.005 (formerly 6253.6); 7927.700 (formerly 6254, subd. (c)); 7925.000 (formerly 6254, subd. (j)); 7927.100 (formerly 6254, subd. (j)); 7925.005 (formerly 6254, subd. (n)); 7924.505 (formerly 6254, subd. (o)); 7927.000 (formerly 6254, subd. (r)); 7923.800 (formerly 6254, subd. (u)(1)); 7923.805 (formerly 6254, subs. (u)(2)-(u)(3)); 7925.010 (formerly 6254, subd. (x)); 7923.700 (formerly 6254, subd. (z)); 7926.100 (formerly 6254, subd. (ac)); 7929.400 (formerly 6254, subd. (ad)(1)); 7929.415 (formerly 6254, subd. (ad)(4)); 7929.420 (formerly 6254, subd. (ad)(5)); 7929.425 (formerly 6254, subd. (ad)(6)); 7927.415 (formerly 6254.1, subd. (a)); 7927.405 (formerly 6254.1 (b)); 7929.600 (formerly 6254.1, subd. (c)); 7924.300-7924.335 (formerly 6254.2); 7928.300 (formerly 6254.3); 7924.000 (formerly 6254.4); 7927.005 (formerly 6254.10); 7924.500 (formerly 6254.11); 7929.610 (formerly 6254.13); 7927.605 (formerly 6254.15); 7927.410 (formerly 6254.16); 7923.755 (formerly 6254.17); 7926.400-7926.430 (formerly 6254.18); 7927.400 (formerly 6254.20); 7928.200-7928.230 (formerly 6254.21); 7922.200 (formerly 6254.29); 7927.105 (formerly 6267); 7928.005 & 7928.010 (formerly 6268).
governmental operation in the public’s interest. A few exemptions appear to focus equally on protecting privacy rights and effective government. Those include: an exemption for law enforcement records; an exemption that incorporates into the PRA exemptions from disclosure in other state and federal laws, including privileges contained in the Evidence Code; and the “public interest” or “catch-all” exemption, where, based on the particular facts, the public interest in not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Additionally, the deliberative process privilege reflects both the public interests in privacy and government effectiveness by affording a measure of privacy to decision-makers that is intended to aid in the efficiency and effectiveness of government decision-making.

The balance that the PRA strikes among the often-competing interests of government transparency and accountability, privacy rights, and government effectiveness intentionally favors transparency and accountability. The PRA is intended to reserve “islands of privacy upon the broad seas of enforced disclosure.” For the past five decades, courts have balanced those competing interests in deciding whether to order disclosure of records. The courts have consistently construed exemptions from disclosure narrowly and agencies’ disclosure obligations broadly. Ambiguities in the PRA must be interpreted in a way that maximizes the public’s access to information unless the Legislature has expressly provided otherwise.

The PRA requires local agencies, as keepers of the public’s records, to balance the public interests in transparency, privacy, and effective government in response to records requests. Certain provisions in the PRA help maintain the balancing scheme established under the PRA and the cases interpreting it by prohibiting state and local agencies from delegating their balancing role and making arrangements with other entities that could limit access to public records. For example, state and local agencies may not allow another party to control the disclosure of information otherwise subject to disclosure under the PRA. Also, state and local agencies may not provide public records subject to disclosure under the PRA to a private entity in a way that prevents a state or local agency from providing the records directly pursuant to the PRA.

---

21 The following exemptions contained in the PRA appear primarily intended to support effective government: Gov. Code, §§ 7927.500 (formerly 6254, subd. (a)); 7927.200 (formerly 6254, subd. (b)); 7929.000 (formerly 6254, subd. (d)); 7927.300 (formerly 6254, subd. (e)); 7929.605 (formerly 6254, subd. (g)); 7928.705 (formerly 6254, subd. (h)); 7928.000 (formerly 6254, subd. (i)); 7928.100 (formerly 6254, subd. (m)); 7928.405-7928–410 (formerly 6254, subd. (p)); 7926.220 (formerly 6254, subd. (q)); 7926.000 (formerly 6254, subd. (s)); 7926.210 (formerly 6254, subd. (t)); 7926.222, subs. (a)–(d) (formerly 6254, subds. (v)(1), (v)(1)(A), (v)(1)(B)); 7926.235 (formerly 6254, subd. (w)); 7926.230 (formerly 6254, subd. (y)); 7929.200 (formerly 6254, subd. (a)); 7929.205 (formerly 6254, subd. (ab)); 7929.405-7929.410 (formerly 6254, subs. (ad)(2) & (ad)(3)); 7927.600 (formerly 6254.6); 7924.510 (formerly 6254.7); 7922.585 (formerly 6254.9); 7926.215 (formerly 6254.14); 7929.210 (formerly 6254.19); 7926.205 (formerly 6254.22); 7929.215 (formerly 6254.23); 7927.205 (formerly 6254.27); 7922.205 (formerly 6254.28).

22 Gov. Code, §§ 7923.600-7293.625, 7927.705 (formerly §§ 6254, subds. (f) and (k)); Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255).

23 Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255); Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court, supra, 53 Cal.3d at pp. 1339–1344.


28 Gov. Code, § 7921.005 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.3).

29 Gov. Code, § 7921.010 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6270, subd. (a)).
**PRACTICE TIP:**

Even though contracts or settlement agreements between agencies and private parties may require that the parties give each other notice of requests for the contract or settlement agreement, such agreements cannot purport to permit private parties to dictate whether the agreement is a public record subject to disclosure.

---

**Incorporation of the PRA into the California Constitution**

**Proposition 59**

In November 2004, the voters approved Proposition 59, which amended the California Constitution to include the public’s right to access public records: “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.” As amended, the California Constitution provides each statute, court rule, and other authority “shall be broadly construed if it furthers the people’s right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access.” The Proposition 59 amendments expressly retained and did not supersede or modify other existing constitutional, statutory, or regulatory provisions, including the rights of privacy, due process, and equal protection, as well as any constitutional, statutory, or common-law exception to the right of access to public records in effect on the amendments’ effective date. That includes any statute protecting the confidentiality of law enforcement and prosecution records.

The courts and the California Attorney General have determined that the constitutional provisions added by Proposition 59 maintain the established principles that disclosure obligations under the PRA must be construed broadly, and exemptions construed narrowly. By approving Proposition 59, the voters have incorporated into the California Constitution the PRA policy prioritizing government transparency and accountability, as well as the PRA’s careful balancing of the public’s right of access to government information with protections for the public interests in privacy and effective government. No case has yet held Proposition 59 substantively altered the balance struck in the PRA between government transparency, privacy protection, and government effectiveness.

**Proposition 42**

In June 2014, the voters approved Proposition 42, which amended the California Constitution “to ensure public access to the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies.” As amended, the Constitution requires local agencies to comply with the PRA, the Ralph M. Brown Act (The Brown Act), any subsequent amendments to either act, any successor act, and any amendments to any successor act that contain findings that the legislation furthers the purposes of public access to public body meetings and public official and agency writings. As amended, the Constitution also no longer requires the state to reimburse local governments for the cost of complying with

---

31 Cal. Const., art. I, § 3, subd. (b)(2).
32 Cal. Const. art. I, § 3, subs. (b)(3), (b)(4) & (b)(5).
34 Cal. Const., art. I, § 3, subd. (b)(7).
35 Cal. Const., art. I, § 3, subd. (b)(7).
legislative mandates in the PRA, the Brown Act, and successor statutes and amendments. Following the enactment of Proposition 42, the Legislature has enacted new local mandates related to public records, including requirements for agency data designated as “open data” that is kept on the Internet and requirements to create and maintain “enterprise system catalogs.”

Expanded Access to Local Government Information

The policy of government records transparency mandated by the PRA is a floor, not a ceiling. Most exemptions from disclosure that apply to the PRA are permissive, not mandatory. Local agencies may choose to disclose public records even though they are exempt, although they cannot be required to do so. The PRA provides that “except as otherwise prohibited by law, a state or local agency may adopt requirements for itself that allow for faster, more efficient, or greater access to records than prescribed by the minimum standards set forth in this chapter.” A number of local agencies have gone beyond the minimum mandates of the PRA by adopting their own “sunshine ordinances” to afford greater public access to public records. Such “sunshine ordinances,” however, do not authorize a locality to enact an ordinance addressing records access that conflicts with the locality’s governing charter.

Local agency disclosure of exempt records can promote the government transparency and accountability purposes of the PRA. However, local agencies are also subject to mandatory duties to safeguard some particularly sensitive records. Unauthorized disclosure of such records can subject local agencies and their officials to civil, and in some cases, criminal liability.

> **PRACTICE TIP:**

Local agencies that expand on the minimum transparency prescribed in the PRA, which is something that the PRA encourages, should ensure that they do not violate their duty to safeguard certain records, or undermine the public’s interest in effective government.

---

36 Cal. Const., art. XIIIB, §6, subd. (a)(4). Proposition 42 was a legislatively-referred constitutional amendment in response to public opposition to AB 1464 and SB 1006 approved June, 2012. The 2012 legislation suspended certain PRA and Brown Act provisions and was intended to eliminate the state’s obligation to reimburse local governments for the cost of complying with PRA and Brown Act mandates through the 2015 fiscal year. There is no record of local agencies ceasing to comply with the suspended provisions.


39 See Gov. Code, § 7921.505 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.5) and “Waiver,” p. 28, regarding the effect of disclosing exempt records.

40 Gov. Code, § 7922.505 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (e)).

41 St. Croix v. Superior Court (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 434, 446. (“Because the charter incorporates the [attorney-client] privilege, an ordinance (whether enacted by the City’s board of supervisors or by the voters) cannot eliminate it, either by designating as not confidential a class of material that otherwise would be protected by the privilege, or by waiving the privilege as to that category of documents; only a charter amendment can achieve that result.”).

42 E.g., individually-identifiable medical information protected under state and federal law (Civ. Code, §§ 56.10(a), 56.05(g); 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-1-d-3); child abuse and neglect records (Pen. Code, § 11167.5); elder abuse and neglect records (Welf. & Inst. Code, §15633); mental health detention records (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 5150, 5328).
Equal Access to Government Records

The PRA affords the same right of access to government information to all types of requesters. Every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as otherwise provided in the PRA, including citizens of other states and countries, elected officials, and members of the press.\(^{43}\) With few exceptions, whenever a local agency discloses an exempt public record to any member of the public, unless the disclosure was inadvertent, all exemptions that apply to that particular record are waived and it becomes subject to disclosure to any and all requesters.\(^{44}\) Accordingly, the PRA ensures equal access to government information by preventing local agencies from releasing exempt records to some requesters but not to others.

Enforced Access to Public Records

To enforce local agencies’ compliance with the PRA’s open government mandate, the PRA provides for the award of court costs and attorneys’ fees to plaintiffs who successfully seek a court ruling ordering disclosure of withheld public records.\(^{45}\) The attorney’s fees policy enforcing records transparency is liberally applied.\(^{46}\)

The PRA at the Crux of Democratic Government in California

Ongoing, important developments in PRA-related constitutional, statutory, and decisional law continue to reflect the central role government’s handling of information plays in balancing tensions inherent in democratic society: considerations of privacy and government transparency, accountability, and effectiveness. Controversial records law issues in California have included government’s use of social media and new law enforcement technologies, and treatment of related records; management and retention of public officials’ emails; open data standards for government information; disclosure of attorney bills; and new legal means for preserving or opposing access to government information.\(^{47}\) Regarding all those issues and others, the PRA has been, and continues to be an indispensable and dynamic arena for simultaneously preserving information transparency, privacy, and effective government, which the California Constitutional and statutory frameworks are intended to guarantee, and on which California citizens continue to insist.

---


\(^{46}\) See “Attorneys Fees and Costs,” p. 69.

Chapter 2

The Basics

The PRA “embodies a strong policy in favor of disclosure of public records.”\(^{48}\) As with any interpretation or construction of legislation, the courts will “first look at the words themselves, giving them their usual and ordinary meaning.”\(^{49}\) Definitions found in the PRA establish the statute’s structure and scope, and guide local agencies, the public, and the courts in achieving the legislative goal of disclosing local agency records while preserving equally legitimate concerns of privacy and government effectiveness.\(^{50}\) It is these definitions that form the “basics” of the PRA.

What are Public Records?

The PRA defines “public records” as “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.”\(^{51}\) The term “public records” encompasses more than simply those documents that public officials are required by law to keep as official records. Courts have held that a public record is one that is “necessary or convenient to the discharge of [an] official duty[,]” such as a status memorandum provided to the city manager on a pending project.\(^{52}\)

Writings

A writing is defined as “any handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, photocopying, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording upon any tangible thing any form of communication or representation, including letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored.”\(^{53}\)


\(^{50}\) See “Exemptions from Disclosure — Protecting the Public’s Fundamental Rights of Privacy and Need for Efficient and Effective Government,” p.6.

\(^{51}\) Gov. Code, § 7920.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (e)).


\(^{53}\) Gov. Code, § 7920.545 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (g)).
The statute unambiguously states that “[p]ublic records” include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.”\(^{54}\) The California Supreme Court relied on this definition to state that a public record has four aspects: “it is (1) a writing, (2) with content related to the conduct of the people’s business, which is (3) prepared by, or (4) owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency.”\(^{55}\) Thus, unless the writing is related “to the conduct of the public’s business” and is “prepared, owned, used or retained by” a local agency, it is not a public record subject to disclosure under the PRA.\(^{56}\)

**Information Relating to the Conduct of Public Business**

Public records include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business.”\(^ {57}\) However, “[c]ommunications that are primarily personal containing no more than incidental mentions of agency business generally will not constitute public records.”\(^ {58}\) Therefore, courts have observed that although a writing is in the possession of the local agency, it is not automatically a public record if it does not also relate to the conduct of the public’s business.\(^ {59}\) For example, records containing primarily personal information, such as an employee’s personal address list or grocery list, are considered outside the scope of the PRA.

**Prepared, Owned, Used, or Retained**

Writings containing information “related to the conduct of the public’s business” must also be “prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency” to be public records subject to the PRA.\(^ {60}\) What is meant by “prepared, owned, used or retained” has been the subject of several court decisions.

Writings need not always be in the physical custody of, or accessible to, a local agency to be considered public records subject to the PRA. The obligation to search for, collect, and disclose the material requested can apply to records in the possession of a local agency’s consultants, which are deemed “owned” by the public agency and in its “constructive possession” when the terms of an agreement between the city and the consultant provide for such ownership.\(^ {61}\) Thus, where a local agency has a contractual right to control the subconsultants or their files, the records may be considered to be within their “constructive possession.”\(^ {62}\) However, a mere contractual right to access documents held by a contractor is not sufficient to establish constructive possession when the agency does not have the authority to manage or control the documents.\(^ {63}\)

---

55  City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 617.
56  Regents of the University of California v. Superior Court, supra, 222 Cal.App.4th at p. 399.
57  Gov. Code, § 7920.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (e)).
58  City of San Jose v. Superior Court, supra, 2 Cal.5th at p. 618-619.
60  Gov. Code, § 7920.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (e)).
61  Consolidated Irrigation District v. Superior Court (2013) 205 Cal.App.4th 697, 710; City of San Jose v. Superior Court, supra, 2 Cal.5th at p.623.
62  Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1428; City of San Jose v. Superior Court, supra, 2 Cal.5th at p. 623.
63  See Anderson-Barker v. Superior Court (2019) 31 Cal.App.5th 528, 541 (“[M]ere access to privately held information is not sufficient to establish possession or control of that information.”)
The PRA has also been held to apply to records possessed by private individuals who perform official functions for a public agency, but only to the extent that the documents are held by the individual for public functions or historically have been provided to the agency.64

Likewise, documents that otherwise meet the definition of public records (including emails and text messages) are considered “retained” by the local agency even when they are actually “retained” on an employee or official’s personal device or account.65

The California Supreme Court has provided some guidance on how a local agency can discover and manage public records located on their employees’ non-governmental devices or accounts. The Court did not endorse or mandate any particular search method, and reaffirmed that the PRA does not prescribe any specific method for searching and that the scope of a local agency’s search for public records need only be “calculated to locate responsive documents.”66

When a local agency receives a request for records that may be held in an employee’s personal account, the local agency’s first step should be to communicate the request not only to the custodian of records but also to any employee or official who may have such information in personal devices or accounts. The Court states that a local agency may then “reasonably rely” on the employees to search their own personal files, accounts, and devices for responsive materials.67

The Court’s guidance, which includes a caveat that they “do not hold that any particular search method is required or necessarily adequate[,]” includes examples of policies and practices in other state and federal courts and agencies, including:68

- Reliance on employees to conduct their own searches and record segregation, so long as the employees have been properly trained on what are public records;
- Where an employee asserts to the local agency that he or she does not have any responsive records on his or her personal device(s) or account(s), he or she may be required by a court (as part of a later court action concerning a records request) to submit an affidavit providing the factual basis for determining whether the record is a public or personal record (e.g., personal notes of meetings and telephone calls protected by deliberative process privilege, versus meeting agendas circulated throughout the entire department.)69
- Adoption of policies that will reduce the likelihood of public records being held in an employee’s private account, including a requirement that employees only use government accounts, or that they copy or forward all email or text messages to the local agency’s official recordkeeping system.70

Documents that a local agency previously possessed but does not actually or constructively possess at the time of the request may not be public records subject to disclosure.71

64 Board of Pilot Commrs v. Superior Court (2013) 218 CA4th 577, 593. But see Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Superior Court (2013) 222 Cal.App.4th 383, 399 (document not prepared, owned, used, or retained by public agency is not public record even though it may contain information relating to conduct of public’s business).

65 City of San Jose v. Superior Court, supra, 2 Cal.5th at p. 629; Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City, supra, 220 Cal.App.4th at p. 1428.

66 City of San Jose v. Superior Court, supra, 2 Cal.5th at p. 627.

67 Id. at p. 628.

68 Id. at pp. 627-629.

69 See Grand Cent. Partnership, Inc. v. Cuomo (2d. Cir. 1999) 166 F.3d 473, 481 for expanded discussion on the use of affidavit in FOIA litigation.

70 See 44 U.S.C. § 2911(a).

Regardless of Physical Form or Characteristics

A public record is subject to disclosure under the PRA “regardless of its physical form or characteristics.” The PRA is not limited by the traditional notion of “writing.” As originally defined in 1968, the legislature did not specifically recognize advancing technology as we consider it today. Amendments beginning in 1970 have added references to “photographs,” “magnetic or punch cards,” “discs,” and “drums” with the current definition of “writing” adopted by the legislature in 2002. Records subject to the PRA include records in any media, including electronic media, in which government agencies may possess records. This is underscored by the definition of “writings” treated as public records under the PRA, which includes “transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording upon any tangible thing any form of communication or representation, including letters, words, pictures, sounds or symbols or combinations thereof, and any record thereby created, regardless of the manner in which the record has been stored.” The legislative intent to incorporate future changes in the character of writings has long been recognized by the courts, which have held that the “definition [of writing] is intended to cover every conceivable kind of record that is involved in the governmental process and will pertain to any new form of record-keeping instrument as it is developed.”

Metadata

Electronic records may include “metadata,” or data about data contained in a record that is not visible in the text. For example, metadata may describe how, when, or by whom particular data was collected, and contain information about document authors, other documents, or commentary or notes. No provision of the PRA expressly addresses metadata, and there are no reported court opinions in California considering whether or the extent to which metadata is subject to disclosure. Evolving law in other jurisdictions has held that local agency metadata is a public record subject to disclosure unless an exemption applies. There are no reported California court opinions providing guidance on whether agencies have a duty to disclose metadata when an electronic record contains exempt information that cannot be reasonably segregated without compromising the record’s integrity.

PRACTICE TIP:

Agencies that receive requests for metadata or requests for records that include metadata should treat the requests the same way they treat all other requests for electronic information and disclose non-exempt metadata.

Agency-Developed Software

The PRA permits government agencies to develop and commercialize computer software and benefit from copyright protections so that such software is not a “public record” under the PRA. This includes computer mapping systems, computer programs, and computer graphics systems. As a result, public agencies are not required to provide copies.

---

72 Gov. Code, § 7920.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (c)).
75 Gov. Code, § 7920.545 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (g)).
78 Gov. Code, § 7922.585, subds. (a), (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.9, subds. (a), (b)).
of agency-developed software pursuant to the PRA. The PRA authorizes state and local agencies to sell, lease, or license agency-developed software for commercial or noncommercial use.\(^7^9\) The exception for agency-developed software does not affect the public record status of information merely because it is stored electronically.\(^8^0\)

**Computer Mapping (GIS) Systems**

While computer mapping systems developed by local agencies are not public records subject to disclosure, such systems generally include geographic information system (GIS) data. Many local agencies use GIS programs and databases for a broad range of purposes, including the creation and editing of maps depicting property and facilities of importance to the agency and the public. As with metadata, the PRA does not expressly address GIS information disclosure. However, the California Supreme Court has held that while GIS software is exempt under the PRA, the data in a GIS file format is a public record, and data in a GIS database must be produced.\(^8^1\)

**Specifically Identified Records**

The PRA also expressly makes particular types of records subject to the PRA, subject to disclosure, or both. For example, the PRA provides that the following are public records:

- Contracts of state and local agencies that require a private entity to review, audit, or report on any aspect of the agency, to the extent the contract is otherwise subject to disclosure under the PRA;\(^8^2\)
- Specified pollution information that state or local agencies require applicants to submit, pollution monitoring data from stationary sources, and records of notices and orders to building owners of housing or building law violations;\(^8^3\)
- Employment contracts between state and local agencies and any public official or employee;\(^8^4\) and
- Itemized statements of the total expenditures and disbursements of judicial agencies provided for under the State Constitution.\(^8^5\)

**What Agencies are Covered?**

The PRA applies to state and local agencies. A state agency is defined as “every state office, officer, department, division, bureau, board and commission or other state body or agency.”\(^8^6\) A local agency includes a county, city (whether general law or chartered), city and county, school district, municipal corporation, special district, community college district, or political subdivision.\(^8^7\) This encompasses any committees, boards, commissions, or departments

---

\(^7^9\) Gov. Code, § 7922.585, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.9, subd. (a)).
\(^8^0\) Gov. Code, § 7922.585, subd. (d) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.9, subd. (d)).
\(^8^2\) Gov. Code, § 7928.700 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.31).
\(^8^3\) Gov. Code, § 7924.510 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.7). See also Masonite Corp. v. County of Mendocino Air Quality Management District (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 436, 450–453 (regarding trade secret information that may be exempt from disclosure).
\(^8^4\) Gov. Code, § 7928.400 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.8). But see Versaci v. Superior Court (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 805, 817 (holding that reference in a public employee's contract to future personal performance goals, to be set and thereafter reviewed as a part of, and in conjunction with, a public employee's performance evaluation does not incorporate such documents into the employee's performance for the purposes of the Act).
\(^8^6\) Gov. Code, § 7920.540, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code § 6252, subd. (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.
\(^8^7\) Gov. Code, § 7920.510 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (a)).
of those entities as well. A local agency also includes “another local public agency.” Finally, a local agency includes a private entity, including a nonprofit entity, where that entity: (1) was created by the elected legislative body of a local agency to exercise authority that may be lawfully delegated to a private entity; (2) receives funds from a local agency, and whose governing board includes a member of the local agency’s legislative body who is appointed by that legislative body and who is a full voting member of the private entity’s governing board; or (3) is the lessee of a hospital, as described in subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54952.

The PRA does not apply to the state Legislature or the judicial branch. The Legislative Open Records Act covers the Legislature. Most court records are disclosable as the courts have historically recognized the public’s right of access to public records maintained by the courts under the common law and the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

**Who Can Request Records?**

All “persons” have the right to inspect and copy non-exempt public records. A “person” need not be a resident of California or a citizen of the United States to make use of the PRA. “Persons” include corporations, partnerships, limited liability companies, firms, or associations. Often, requesters include persons who have filed claims or lawsuits against the government, who are investigating the possibility of doing so, or who just want to know what their government officials are up to. With certain exceptions, neither the media nor a person who is the subject of a public record has any greater right of access to public records than any other person.

Local agencies and their officials are entitled to access public records on the same basis as any other person. Further, local agency officials might be authorized to access public records of their own agency that are otherwise exempt if such access is permitted by law as part of their official duties. Under such circumstances, however, the local agency shall not discriminate between or among local agency officials as to which writing or portion thereof is to be made available or when it is made available.
Responding to a Public Records Request

Local Agency’s Duty to Respond to Public Record Requests

The fundamental purpose of the PRA is to provide access to information about the conduct of the people’s business. This right of access to public information imposes a duty on local agencies to respond to PRA requests and does not “permit an agency to delay or obstruct the inspection or copying of public records.” Even if the request does not reasonably describe an identifiable record, the requested record does not exist, or the record is exempt from disclosure, the agency must respond.

Types of Requests — Right to Inspect or Copy Public Records

There are two ways to gain access under the PRA to a public record: (1) inspecting the record at the local agency’s offices or on the local agency’s website; or (2) obtaining a copy from the local agency. The local agency may not dictate to the requester which option must be used, that is the requester’s decision. Moreover, a requester does not have to choose between inspection and copying but instead can choose both options. For example, a requester may first inspect a set of records, and then, based on that review, decide which records should be copied.

100 Gov. Code, § 7922.500 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (d)).
102 Gov. Code, §§ 7922.525; 7922.530, subd. (a); 7922.545 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subsds. (a), (b), & (f)).
PRACTICE TIP:
If the public records request does not make clear whether the requester wants to inspect or obtain a copy of the record or records being sought, the local agency should seek clarification from the requester without delaying the process of searching for, collecting, and redacting or “whiting out” exempt information in the records.

PRACTICE TIP:
To protect the integrity of the local agency files and preserve the orderly function of the offices, agencies may establish reasonable policies for the inspection and copying of public records.

Right to Inspect Public Records

Public records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record. This right to inspect includes any reasonably segregable portion of a public record after deletion of the portions that are exempted by law.¹⁰³ This does not mean that a requester has a right to demand to see a record and immediately gain access to it. The right to inspect is constrained by an implied rule of reason to protect records against theft, mutilation, or accidental damage; prevent interference with the orderly functioning of the office; and generally avoid chaos in record archives.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, the agency’s time to respond to an inspection request is governed by the deadlines set forth below, which give the agency a reasonable opportunity to search for, collect, and, if necessary, redact exempt information prior to the records being disclosed in an inspection.¹⁰⁵

In addition, in lieu of providing inspection access at the local agency’s office, a local agency may post the requested public record on its website and direct a member of the public to the website. If a member of the public requests a copy of the record because of the inability to access or reproduce the record from the website, the local agency must provide a copy.¹⁰⁶

PRACTICE TIP:
Local agencies may want to limit the number of record inspectors present at one time at a records inspection. The local agency may also want to prohibit the use of cell phones to photograph records where the inspection is of architectural or engineering plans with copyright protection.

¹⁰³ Gov. Code, § 7922.525 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (a)).
¹⁰⁵ See “Timing of The Response” p. 22.
¹⁰⁶ Gov. Code, §§ 7922.530, subd. (a); 7922.545 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subsds. (b), (f)).
Right to Copy Public Records

Except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, a local agency, upon receipt of a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, must make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of the appropriate fees. If a copy of a record has been requested, the local agency generally must provide an exact copy except where it is “impracticable” to do so. The term “impracticable” does not necessarily mean that compliance with the public records request would be inconvenient or time-consuming to the local agency. Rather, it means that the agency must provide the best or most complete copy of the requested record that is reasonably possible. As with the right to inspect public records, the same rule of reasonableness applies to the right to obtain copies of those records. Thus, the local agency may impose reasonable restrictions on general requests for copies of voluminous classes of documents.

The PRA does not provide for a standing or continuing request for documents that may be generated in the future. However, the Brown Act provides that a person may make a request to receive a mailed copy of the agenda, or all documents constituting the agenda packet for any meeting of the legislative body. This request shall be valid for the calendar year in which it is filed. A person may also make a request to receive local agency notices, such as public work contractor plan room documents, and development impact fee, public hearing, or California Environmental Quality Act notices. The local agency may impose a reasonable fee for these requests.

▸ PRACTICE TIP:
Agencies may consider the use of outside copy services for oversize records or a voluminous record request, provided that the requester consents to it and pays the appropriate fees in advance. Alternatively, local agencies may consider allowing the requester to use his or her own copy service.

Form of the Request

A public records request may be made in writing or orally, in person or by phone. Further, a written request may be made in paper or electronic form and may be mailed, emailed, faxed, or personally delivered. A local agency may ask, but cannot require, that the requester put an oral request in writing. In general, a written request is preferable to an oral request because it provides a record of when the request was made and what was requested, and helps the agency respond in a more timely and thorough manner.

107 See “Fees,” p. 27.
108 Gov. Code, §§ 7922.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (b)).
111 Gov. Code, §§ 7920.530; 7920.545; 7922.525 & 7922.530, subd, (b) (formerly Gov. Code, §§ 6252, subds. (e) & (g); and 6253, subds. (a) & (b)).
PRACTICE TIP:
Though not legally required, a local agency may find it convenient to use a written form for public records requests, particularly for those instances when a requester “drops in” to an office and asks for one or more records. The local agency cannot require the requester to use a particular form, but having the form, and even having agency staff assist with filling out the form, may help agencies better identify the information sought, follow up with the requester using the contact information provided, and provide more effective assistance to the requester in compliance with the PRA.

Content of the Request
A public records request must reasonably describe an identifiable record or records.\(^\text{118}\) It must be focused, specific,\(^\text{119}\) and reasonably clear, so that the local agency can decipher what record or records are being sought.\(^\text{120}\) A request that is so open-ended that it amounts to asking for all of a department’s files is not reasonable. If a request is not clear or is overly broad, the local agency has a duty to assist the requester in reformulating the request to make it clearer or less broad.\(^\text{121}\)

A request does not need to precisely identify the record or records being sought. For example, a requester may not know the exact date of a record, its title, or author, but if the request is descriptive enough for the local agency to understand which records fall within its scope, the request is reasonable. Requests may identify writings somewhat generally by their content.\(^\text{122}\)

No magic words need to be used to trigger the local agency’s obligation to respond to a request for records. The content of the request must simply indicate that a public record is being sought. Occasionally, a requester may incorrectly refer to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) as the legal basis for the request. This does not excuse the agency from responding if the request seeks public records. A public records request does not need to state its purpose or the use to which the record will be put by the requester.\(^\text{123}\) A requester does not have to justify or explain the reason for exercising his or her fundamental right of access.\(^\text{124}\)

PRACTICE TIP:
A public records request is different than a question or series of questions posed to local agency officials or employees. The PRA creates no duty to answer written or oral questions submitted by members of the public. But, if an existing and readily available record contains information that would directly answer a question, it is advisable to either answer the question or provide the record in response to the question.

---

\(^{118}\) Gov. Code, § 7922.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (b)).


\(^{121}\) See “Assisting the Requester,” p. 24.


\(^{123}\) See Gov. Code, § 7921.300 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6257.5).

\(^{124}\) Gov. Code, § 7921.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6250); Cal. Const., art. I, § 3.
A PRA request applies only to records existing at the time of the request.\textsuperscript{125} It does not require a local agency to produce records that may be created in the future. Further, a local agency is not required to provide requested information in a format that the local agency does not use.

**Timing of the Response**

**Inspection of Public Records**

Although the law precisely defines the time for responding to a public records request for copies of records, it is less precise in defining the deadline for disclosing records. Because the PRA does not state how soon a requester seeking to inspect records must be provided access to them, it is generally assumed that the standard of promptness set forth for copies of records\textsuperscript{126} applies to inspection. This assumption is bolstered by the provision in the PRA that states, “\textit{[n]othing in this chapter shall be construed to permit an agency to delay or obstruct the inspection or copying of public records},”\textsuperscript{127} which again signals the importance of promptly disclosing records to the requester.

Neither the 10-day response period for responding to a request for a copy of records, nor the additional 14-day extension, may be used to delay or obstruct the inspection of public records.\textsuperscript{128} For example, requests for commonly disclosed records that are held in a manner that allows for prompt disclosure should not be withheld because of the statutory response period.

**Copies of Public Records**

Time is critical in responding to a request for copies of public records. A local agency must respond promptly, but no later than 10 calendar days from receipt of the request, to notify the requester whether records will be disclosed.\textsuperscript{129} If the request is received after business hours or on a weekend or holiday, the next business day may be considered the date of receipt. The 10-day response period starts with the first calendar day after the date of receipt.\textsuperscript{130} If the tenth day falls on a weekend or holiday, the next business day is considered the deadline for responding to the request.\textsuperscript{131}

> **PRACTICE TIP:**

To ensure compliance with the 10-day deadline, it is wise for local agencies to develop a system for identifying and tracking public records requests. For example, a local agency with large departments may find it useful to have a public records request coordinator within each department. It is also very helpful to develop and implement a policy for handling public records requests in order to ensure the agency’s compliance with the law.

\textsuperscript{125} Gov. Code, § 7922.535 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (c)).


\textsuperscript{127} Gov. Code, § 7922.500 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (d)).

\textsuperscript{128} Gov. Code, § 7922.500 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (d)). See also “Extending the Response Times for Copies of Public Records,” p. 23.

\textsuperscript{129} Gov. Code, § 7922.535, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (c)).

\textsuperscript{130} Civ. Code, § 10.

\textsuperscript{131} Civ. Code, § 11.
PRACTICE TIP:
Watch for shorter statutory time periods for disclosure of particular public records. For example, Statements of Economic Interest (FPPC Form 700) and other campaign statements and filings required by the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Govt Code §§ 81000 et seq) are required to be made available to the public as soon as practicable, and in no event later than the second business day following receipt of the request.132

Extending the Response Times for Copies of Public Records
A local agency may extend the 10-day response period for copies of public records for up to 14 additional calendar days because of the need:

- To search for and collect the requested records from field facilities or other establishments separate from the office processing the request;
- To search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records demanded in a single request;
- To consult with another agency having substantial interest in the request (such as a state agency), or among two or more components of the local agency (such as two city departments) with substantial interest in the request; or
- In the case of electronic records, to compile data, write programming language or a computer program, or to construct a computer report to extract data.133

No other reasons justify an extension of time to respond to a request for copies of public records. For example, a local agency may not extend the time on the basis that it has other pressing business or that the employee most knowledgeable about the records sought is on vacation or is otherwise unavailable.

If a local agency exercises its right to extend the response time beyond the 10-day period, it must do so in writing, stating the reason or reasons for the extension, and the anticipated date of the response within the 14-day extension period.134 The agency does not need the consent of the requester to extend the time for response.

PRACTICE TIP:
If a local agency is having difficulty responding to a public records request within the 10-day response period and there does not appear to be grounds to extend the response period for an additional 14 days, the agency may obtain an extension by consent of the requester. Often a requester will cooperate with the agency on such matters as the timing of the response, particularly if the requester believes the agency is acting reasonably and conscientiously in processing the request. It is also advisable to document in writing any extension agreed to by the requester.

133 Gov. Code, § 7922.535 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subds. (c)(1)-(4)).
134 Gov. Code, § 7922.535 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (c)).
Timing of Disclosure

The time limit for responding to a public records request is not necessarily the same as the time within which the records must be disclosed to the requester. As a practical matter, records often are disclosed at the same time the local agency responds to the request. But in some cases, that time frame for disclosure is not feasible because of the volume of records encompassed by the request.

PRACTICE TIP:

When faced with a voluminous public records request, a local agency has numerous options — for example, asking the requester to narrow the request, asking the requester to consent to a later deadline for responding to the request, and providing responsive records (whether redacted or not) on a “rolling” basis, rather than in one complete package. It is sometimes possible for the agency and requester to work cooperatively to streamline a public records request, with the result that the requester obtains the records or information the requester truly wants and the burdens on the agency in complying with the request are reduced. If any of these options are used, it is advisable that it is documented in writing.

Assisting the Requester

Local agencies must assist requesters who are having difficulty making a focused and effective request. To the extent reasonable under the circumstances, a local agency must:

- Assist the requester in identifying records that are responsive to the request or the purpose of the request, if stated;
- Describe the information technology and physical location in which the record or records exist; and
- Provide suggestions for overcoming any practical basis for denying access to the record or records.

Alternatively, the local agency may satisfy its duty to assist the requester by giving the requester an index of records. Ordinarily, an inquiry into a requester’s purpose in seeking access to a public record is inappropriate, but such an inquiry may be proper if it will help assist the requester in making a focused request that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records.

Locating Records

Local agencies must make a reasonable effort to search for and locate requested records, including by asking probing questions of city staff and consultants. No bright-line test exists to determine whether an effort is reasonable. That determination will depend on the facts and circumstances surrounding each request. In general, upon the local agency’s receipt of a public records request, those persons or offices that would most likely be in possession of responsive records should be consulted in an effort to locate the records. For a local agency to have a duty to locate

---

136 Gov. Code, § 7922.600, subds. (a)(1)-(3) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.1, subds. (a)(1)-(3)).
137 Gov. Code, § 7922.600, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.1, subd. 1(d)(3)).
139 Gov. Code, § 7922.600, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.1, subd. (a)).
records, they must qualify as public records. Thus, unless the writing is related ‘to the conduct of the public’s business’ and is ‘prepared, owned, used or retained by’ a public entity, it is not a public record under the PRA, and its disclosure would not be governed by the PRA. No words in the statute suggest that the public entity has an obligation to obtain documents even though it has not prepared, owned, used or retained them.

**PRACTICE TIP:**

To ensure compliance with the PRA, and in anticipation of court scrutiny of agency diligence in locating responsive records, agencies may want to consider adopting policies similar to those required by state and federal E-discovery statutes to prevent records destruction while a request is pending.

The right to access public records is not without limits. A local agency is not required to perform a “needle in a haystack” search to locate the record or records sought by the requester. Nor is it compelled to undergo a search that will produce a “huge volume” of material in response to the request. On the other hand, an agency typically will endure some burden — at times, a significant burden — in its records search. Usually that burden alone will be insufficient to justify noncompliance with the request. Nevertheless, if the request imposes a substantial enough burden, an agency may decide to withhold the requested records on the basis that the public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

**Types of Responses**

After conducting a reasonable search for requested records, a local agency has only a limited number of possible responses. If the search yielded no responsive records, the agency must inform the requester. If the agency has located a responsive record, it must decide whether to: (1) disclose the record; (2) withhold the record; or (3) disclose the record in redacted form.

**PRACTICE TIP:**

Care should be taken in deciding whether to disclose, withhold, or redact a record. It is advisable to consult with the local agency’s legal counsel before making this decision, particularly when a public records request presents novel or complicated issues or implicates policy concerns or third-party rights.

If a written public records request is denied because the local agency does not have the record or has decided to withhold it, or if the requested record is disclosed in redacted form, the agency’s response must be in writing and must identify by name and title each person responsible for the decision.

---

141 See “What are Public Records?” p. 12.


144 Ibid. But see Getz v. Superior Court of El Dorado County (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 637 (holding that a request that required a public agency to review over 40,000 emails from specified email addresses was not overly burdensome because the emails requested were easy to locate).

145 Ibid.


147 Gov. Code, § 7922.540, subds. (a)-(b) (formerly Gov. Code, §§ 6253, subd. (d), 6255, subd. (b)).
PRACTICE TIP:
A local agency should always document that it is supplying the record to the requester. The fact and sufficiency of the response may become points of dispute with the requester.

PRACTICE TIP:
Although not required, any response that denies in whole, or in part, an oral public records request should be put in writing.

If the record is withheld in its entirety or provided to the requester in redacted form, the local agency must state the legal basis under the PRA for its decision not to comply fully with the request. Statements like “We don’t give up those types of records” or “Our policy is to keep such records confidential” will not suffice.

Redacting Records
Some records contain information that must be disclosed, along with information that is exempt from disclosure. A local agency has a duty to provide such a record to the requester in redacted form if the nonexempt information is “reasonably segregable” from that which is exempt, unless the burden of redacting the record becomes too great. What is reasonably segregable will depend on the circumstances. If exempt information is inextricably intertwined with nonexempt information, the record may be withheld in its entirety.

No Duty to Create a Record or a Privilege Log
A local agency has no duty to create a record that does not exist at the time of the request. There is also no duty to reconstruct a record that was lawfully discarded prior to receipt of the request. However, an agency may be liable for attorney fees when a court determines the agency was not sufficiently diligent in locating requested records, even when the requested records no longer exist. The PRA does not require that a local agency create a “privilege log” or list that identifies the specific records being withheld. The response only needs to identify the legal grounds for nondisclosure. If the agency creates a privilege log for its own use, however, that document may be considered a public record and may be subject to disclosure in response to a later public records request.

149 Gov. Code, § 7922.525 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (a)); American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of North California, Inc. v. Deukmejian, supra, 32 Cal.3d at p. 458.
150 American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of North California, Inc. v. Deukmejian, supra, 32 Cal.3d at p. 452–454; Becerra v. Superior Court, supra, 44 Cal. App.5th at p. 939-934.
151 Ibid.
154 Haynie v. Superior Court, supra, 26 Cal.4th, at p. 1075.
PRACTICE TIP:
To ensure compliance with the PRA or in anticipation of court scrutiny of the agency’s due diligence, the local agency may wish to maintain a separate file for copies of records that have been withheld and those produced (including redacted versions).

Fees
The public records process is in many respects cost-free to the requester. The local agency may only charge a fee for the direct cost of duplicating a record when the requester is seeking a copy, or it may charge a statutory fee, if applicable. A local agency may require payment in advance, before providing the requested copies; however, no payment can be required merely to look at a record where copies are not sought.

Direct cost of duplication is the cost of running the copy machine, and conceivably the expense of the person operating it. “Direct cost” does not include the ancillary tasks necessarily associated with the retrieval, inspection, and handling of the file from which the copy is extracted. For example, if concern for the security of records requires that an agency employee sit with the requester during the inspection, or if a record must be redacted before it can be inspected, the agency may not bill the requester for that expenditure of staff time.

PRACTICE TIP:
The direct cost of duplication charged for a PRA request should be supported by a fee study adopted by a local agency resolution.

Although permitted to charge a fee for duplication costs, a local agency may choose to reduce or waive that fee. For example, the agency might waive the fee in a particular case because the requester is indigent; or it might generally choose to waive fees below a certain dollar threshold because the administrative costs of collecting the fee would exceed the revenue to be collected. An agency may also set a customary copying fee for all requests that is lower than the amount of actual duplication costs.

PRACTICE TIP:
If a local agency selectively waives or reduces the duplication fee, it should apply standards for waiver or reduction with consistency to avoid charges of favoritism or discrimination toward particular requesters.

155 Gov. Code, § 7922.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (b)).
157 Gov. Code, § 7922.530, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253, subd. (b)).
Duplication costs of electronic records are limited to the direct cost of producing the electronic copy and does not include cost of redaction.\textsuperscript{161} For example, a city cannot charge requesters for time city employees spent searching for, reviewing, and editing videos to redact exempt, but otherwise producible, data. However, requesters may be required to bear additional costs of producing a copy of an electronic record, such as programming and computer services costs, if the request requires the production of electronic records that are otherwise only produced at regularly scheduled intervals, or if production of the record would require data compilation, extraction, or programming. Agencies are not required to reconstruct electronic copies of records no longer available to the agency in electronic format.

**PRACTICE TIP:**

If there is a request for public records pursuant to Government Code section 7922.575 requiring “data compilation, extraction, or programming to produce the record” the local agency should ask the requester to pay the fees in advance, before the “data compilation, extraction, or programming” is actually done.

### Waiver

Generally, whenever a local agency discloses an otherwise exempt public record to any member of the public, the disclosure constitutes a waiver of most of the exemptions contained in the PRA for all future requests for the same information. The waiver provision in Government Code section 7921.505 applies to an intentional disclosure of privileged documents, and a local agency’s inadvertent release of attorney-client documents does not waive such privilege.\textsuperscript{162} There are, however, a number of statutory exceptions to the waiver provisions, including, among others, disclosures made through discovery or other legal proceedings, and disclosures made to another governmental agency that agrees to treat the disclosed material as confidential.

---

\textsuperscript{161} National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward (2020) 9 Cal.5th 488, 492.

Specific Document Types, Categories, and Exemptions from Disclosure

Overview of Exemptions

This chapter discusses how to address requests for certain specific types and categories of commonly requested records and many of the most frequently raised exemptions from disclosure that may, or in some cases, must be asserted by local agencies.

Transparent and accessible government is the foundational objective of the PRA. This recently constitutionalized right of access to the writings of local agencies and officials was declared by the Legislature in 1968 to be a “fundamental and necessary right.”163 While this right of access is not absolute, it must be construed broadly.164 The PRA contains over 75 express exemptions, many of which are discussed below, including one for records that are otherwise exempt from disclosure by state or federal statutes,165 and a balancing test, known as the “public interest” or “catchall” provision. This “catchall” provision allows local agencies to justify withholding any record by demonstrating that on the facts of a particular case, the public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.166

When local agencies claim an exemption or prohibition to disclosure of all or a part of a record, they must identify the specific exemption to disclosure in the response.167 Where a record contains some information that is subject to an

164 Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(2); City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608, 617.
166 Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255, subd. (a)); Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach, supra, 59 Cal.4th at p. 67. See also “Public Interest Exemption,” p. 63.
exemption and other information that is not, the local agency may redact the information that is exempt (identifying the exemption), but must otherwise still produce the record. Unless a statutory exemption applies, the public is entitled to access or a copy.\(^\text{168}\)

\[\text{PRACTICE TIP:}\]
When evaluating a record to determine whether it falls within an exemption in the PRA, do not overlook exemptions and even prohibitions to disclosure that are contained in other state and federal statutes, including, for example, evidentiary privileges, medical privacy laws, police officer personnel record privileges, official information, information technology or infrastructure security systems, etc. Many of these other statutory exemptions or prohibitions are also discussed below.

### Types of Records and Specific Exemptions

#### Architectural and Official Building Plans

The PRA recognizes exemptions to the disclosure of a record “which is exempted or prohibited [from disclosure] pursuant to federal or state law ....”\(^\text{169}\) Under this rule, architectural and official building plans may be exempt from disclosure, because: (1) architectural plans submitted by third parties to local agencies may qualify for federal copyright protections;\(^\text{170}\) (2) local agencies may claim a copyright in many of their own records; or (3) state laws address inspection and duplication of building plans by members of the public.\(^\text{171}\)

“Architectural work,” defined under federal law as the “design of a building as embodied in any tangible medium of expression, including a building, architectural plans, or drawings,”\(^\text{172}\) is considered an “original work of authorship,”\(^\text{173}\) which has automatic federal copyright protection.\(^\text{174}\) Architectural plans may be inspected, but cannot be copied without the permission of the owner.\(^\text{175}\)

\[\text{PRACTICE TIP:}\]
Some requesters will cite the “fair use of copyrighted materials” doctrine as giving them the right to copy architectural plans.\(^\text{176}\) The fair use rule is a defense to a copyright infringement action only and not a legal entitlement to obtain copyrighted materials.\(^\text{177}\)

---


\(^{169}\) Gov. Code, § 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (k)).


\(^{171}\) Health & Saf. Code, § 19851.


\(^{175}\) 17 U.S.C. § 106.


The official copy of building plans maintained by a local agency’s building department may be inspected, but cannot be copied without the local agency first requesting the written permission of the licensed or registered professional who signed the document and the original or current property owner.\textsuperscript{178} A request made by the building department via registered or certified mail for written permission from the professional must give the professional at least 30 days to respond and be accompanied by a statutorily prescribed affidavit signed by the person requesting copies, attesting that the copy of the plans shall only be used for the maintenance, operation, and use of the building, that the drawings are instruments of professional service and are incomplete without the interpretation of the certified, licensed, or registered professional of record, and that a licensed architect who signs and stamps plans, specifications, reports, or documents shall not be responsible for damage caused by subsequent unauthorized changes to or uses of those plans.\textsuperscript{179} After receiving this required information, the professional cannot withhold written permission to make copies of the plans.\textsuperscript{180} These statutory requirements do not prohibit duplication of reduced copies of plans that have been distributed to local agency decision-making bodies as part of the agenda materials for a public meeting.\textsuperscript{181}

The California Attorney General has determined that interim grading documents, including geology, compaction, and soils reports, are public records that are not exempt from disclosure.\textsuperscript{182}

**Attorney-Client Communications and Attorney Work Product**

The PRA specifically exempts from disclosure “records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, the provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.”\textsuperscript{183} The PRA’s exemptions protect attorney-client privileged communications and attorney work product, as well as, more broadly, other work product prepared for use in pending litigation or claims.\textsuperscript{184}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{PRACTICE TIP:}
Penal Code section 832.7 contains specific rules relating to the application of attorney-client privilege, and disclosure of attorney bills and retainer agreements relating to peace officer personnel records.\textsuperscript{185}
\end{quote}

**Attorney-Client Privilege**

The attorney-client privilege protects from disclosure the entirety of confidential communications between attorney and client, as well as among the attorneys within a firm or in-house legal department representing such client, including factual and other information, not in itself privileged outside of attorney-client communications.\textsuperscript{186} The fundamental purpose of the attorney-client privilege is preservation of the confidential relationship between attorney and client. It is not necessary to demonstrate that prejudice would result from disclosure of attorney-client

\textsuperscript{178} Health & Saf. Code, \$ 19851.
\textsuperscript{179} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{181} Gov. Code, \$ 54957.5.
\textsuperscript{183} Gov. Code, \$ 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, \$ 6254, subd. (k)).
\textsuperscript{185} See “Peace Officer Personnel Records,” p. 53.
communications to prevent such disclosure. When the party claiming the privilege shows the dominant purpose of the relationship between the parties to the communication was one of attorney and client, the communication is protected by the privilege. Unlike the exemption for pending litigation, attorney-client privileged information is still protected from disclosure even after litigation is concluded. But note, the attorney-client privilege will likely not protect communication between a public employee and his or her personal attorney if that communication occurs using a public entity’s computer system and the public entity has a computer policy that indicates the computers are intended for the public entity’s business and are subject to monitoring by the employer.

The attorney plaintiff in a wrongful termination suit and the defendant insurer may reveal privileged third-party attorney-client communications to their own attorneys to the extent necessary for the litigation, but may not publicly disclose such communications.

Attorney Work Product

Any writing that reflects an attorney’s impressions, conclusions, opinions, legal research, or theories is not discoverable under any circumstances and is thus exempt from disclosure under the PRA. There is also a qualified privilege against disclosure of materials (e.g., witness statements, other investigative materials) developed by an attorney in preparing a case for trial as thoroughly as possible, with a degree of privacy necessary to uncover and investigate both favorable and unfavorable aspects of a case.

Common Interest Doctrine

The common interest doctrine may also protect communications with third parties from disclosure where the communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege or attorney-work-product doctrine, and maintaining the confidentiality of the communication is necessary to accomplish the purpose for which legal advice was sought. The common interest doctrine is not an independent privilege; rather, it is a nonwaiver doctrine that may be used by plaintiffs or defendants alike. For the common interest doctrine to attach, the parties to the shared communication must have a reasonable expectation that the information disclosed will remain confidential. Further, the parties must have a common interest in a matter of joint concern. In other words, they must have a common interest in securing legal advice related to the same matter, and the communication must be made to advance their shared interest in securing legal advice on that common matter.

---

192 Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030, subds. (a) & (b); Gov. Code, § 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (k)).
194 Id. at p. 891.
195 Compare Citizens for Ceres v. Superior Court (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 889, 914–922 (common interest doctrine inapplicable to communications between developer and city prior to approval of application because, pre-project approval, parties lacked a common interest) with California Oak Foundation v. County of Tehama (2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 1217, 1222–1223 (sharing of privileged documents prepared by county’s outside law firm regarding CEQA compliance with project applicant was within common interest doctrine).
Attorney Bills and Retainer Agreements

Attorney billing invoices reflecting work in active and ongoing litigation are exempt from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege or attorney-work-product doctrine. Once a matter is concluded, portions of attorney invoices reflecting fee totals must be disclosed unless such totals reveal anything about the legal consultation, such as insight into litigation strategy, the substance of the legal consultation, or clues about legal strategy.

Retainer agreements between a local agency and its attorneys may constitute confidential communications that fall within the attorney-client privilege. A local agency’s governing body may waive the privilege and elect to produce the agreements.

PRACTICE TIP:
Some agencies simplify redaction of attorney bills and production of non-exempt bill information in response to requests by requiring that non-exempt portions of attorney bills, such as the name of the matter, the invoice amount, and date, be contained in separate documents from privileged bill text.

CEQA Proceedings

Increasingly, potential litigants have been submitting public records requests as a prelude to or during preparation of the administrative record for challenges to the adequacy of an agency’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process or certification of CEQA documents. While there are no specific PRA provisions directly addressing CEQA proceedings, these requests can present multiple challenges as they may seek voluminous amounts of records, such as email communications between staff and consultants, or confidential and privileged documents.

PRACTICE TIP:
A request to prepare an administrative record for a CEQA challenge does not excuse or justify ignoring or delaying responses to a CEQA-related PRA request. A failure to properly or fully respond to the PRA request can lead to claims of violations of the PRA and a demand for attorneys’ fees being included in a CEQA lawsuit. Local agencies should, therefore, exercise the same due diligence when responding to CEQA-related PRA requests as they do with any other type of PRA request. As with any litigation or potential litigation, local agencies should also consider invoking internal litigation holds and evidence preservation practices early on in a contentious CEQA process.

Two particularly challenging issues that arise with CEQA-related PRA requests are whether and to what extent a subcontractor’s files are public records subject to disclosure, and whether the deliberative process privilege or public interest exemption apply to the requested documents.

---

197 County of Los Angeles Bd. of Supervisors v. Superior Court, supra, 12 Cal.App.5th at pp. 1274-1275. See "Pending Litigation or Claims," p. 49.
198 Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6149 (a written fee contract shall be deemed to be a confidential communication within the meaning of section 6068(e) of the Business & Professions Code and section 952 of the Evidence Code); Evid. Code, § 952 ("Confidential communication between client and lawyer"); Evid. Code, § 954 (attorney-client privilege).
199 Evid. Code, § 912. See also Gov. Code, § 7921.505 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.5) and "Waiver," p. 28.
In determining whether a subcontractor’s files are public records in the actual or constructive possession of the local agency, the court will look to the consultant’s contract to determine the extent to which, if any, the local agency had control over the selection of subcontractors, and how they performed services required by the primary consultant.\textsuperscript{201}

\textbf{PRACTICE TIP:}
Examine your contracts with consultants and clearly articulate who owns their work product, and that of their subcontractors.

Requests for materials that implicate the deliberative process privilege or public interest exemption are commonly made in CEQA-related PRA requests. While it may seem obvious that local agency staff and their consultants desire and in fact need to engage in candid dialogue about a project and the approaches to be taken, when invoking the deliberative process privilege to protect such communications from disclosure the local agency must clearly articulate why the privilege applies by more than a simple statement that it helps the process.\textsuperscript{202} Likewise, when invoking the public interest exemption to protect documents from disclosure, local agencies must do more than simply state the conclusion that the public’s interest in nondisclosure is clearly outweighed by the public interest in disclosure.\textsuperscript{203}

\textbf{PRACTICE TIP:}
When evaluating whether the deliberative process privilege applies to documents covered by a PRA request during a pre-litigation CEQA process, keep in mind the close correlation between the drafts exemption, discussed below, and the deliberative process privilege.

\section*{Code Enforcement Records}

Local agencies may pursue code enforcement through administrative or criminal proceedings, or a combination of both. Records of code enforcement cases for which criminal sanctions are sought may be subject to the same disclosure rules as police and other law enforcement records, including the rules for investigatory records and files, as long as there is a concrete and definite prospect of criminal enforcement.\textsuperscript{204} Records of code enforcement cases being prosecuted administratively do not qualify as law enforcement records.\textsuperscript{205} However, some administrative code enforcement information, such as names and contact information of complainants, may be exempt from disclosure under the official information privilege, the identity of informant privilege, or the public interest exemption.\textsuperscript{206}

\section*{Deliberative Process Privilege}

The deliberative process privilege is derived from the public interest exemption, which provides that a local agency may withhold a public record if it can demonstrate that "on the facts of a particular case the public interest served..."
by not making the record public clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.”

The deliberative process privilege was intended to address concerns that frank discussion of legal or policy matters might be inhibited if subject to public scrutiny, and to support the concept that access to a broad array of opinions and the freedom to seek all points of view, to exchange ideas, and to discuss policies in confidence are essential to effective governance in a representative democracy. Therefore, California courts invoke the privilege to protect communications to decisionmakers before a decision is made.

In evaluating whether the deliberative process privilege applies, the court will still perform the balancing test prescribed by the public interest exemption. In doing so, courts focus “less on the nature of the records sought and more on the effect of the records’ release.” Therefore, the key question in every deliberative process privilege case is “whether the disclosure of materials would expose an agency’s decision-making process in such a way as to discourage candid discussion within the agency and thereby undermine the agency’s ability to perform its functions.”

Accordingly, the courts have uniformly drawn a distinction between predecisional communications, which are privileged; and communications made after the decision and designed to explain it, which are not. Protecting the predecisional deliberative process gives the decision-maker “the freedom ‘to think out loud,’ which enables him [or her] to test ideas and debate policy and personalities uninhibited by the danger that his [or her] tentative but rejected thoughts will become subjects of public discussion. Usually, the information is sought with respect to past decisions; the need is even stronger if the demand comes while policy is still being developed.”

Courts acknowledge that even a purely factual document would be exempt from public scrutiny if it is “actually ... related to the process by which policies are formulated” or “inextricably intertwined” with “policy-making processes.” For example, the California Supreme Court applied the deliberative process privilege in determining that the Governor’s appointment calendars and schedules were exempt from disclosure under the PRA even though the information in the appointment calendars and schedules was based on fact. The Court reasoned that such disclosure could inhibit private meetings and chill the flow of information to the executive office.

**Drafts**

The PRA exempts from disclosure “[p]reliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda that are not retained by the public agency in the ordinary course of business, if the public interest in withholding those records clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.” The “drafts” exemption provides a measure of privacy for writings concerning pending local agency action. The exemption was adapted from the FOIA, which exempts from disclosure “preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda that are not retained by the public agency in the ordinary course of business, if the public interest in withholding those records clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.”

---


208 Ibid.; 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5). In some cases, pre-decisional communications may also be subject to the official information privilege found in Evidence Code section 1040. See “Official Information Privilege,” p. 48.


210 Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, supra, 53 Cal.3d at pp. 1338, 1342.

211 Id. at p. 1342, citing Dudman Communications v. Dept. of Air Force (D.C.Gir.1987) 815 F.2d 1565, 1568.


215 Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, supra, 53 Cal.3d at p. 1338.

216 Ibid.

217 Gov. Code, § 7927.500 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (a)).
disclosure “inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency.” The FOIA “memorandums” exemption is based on the policy of protecting the decision-making processes of government agencies, and in particular the frank discussion of legal or policy matters that might be inhibited if subjected to public scrutiny.

The “drafts” exemption in the PRA has essentially the same purpose as the “memorandums” exemption in the FOIA. The key question under the FOIA test is whether the disclosure of materials would expose a local agency’s decision-making process in such a way as to discourage candid discussion within the local agency and thereby undermine the local agency’s ability to perform its functions. To qualify for the “drafts” exemption the record must be a preliminary draft, note, or memorandum; that is not retained by the local agency in the ordinary course of business; and the public interest in withholding the record must clearly outweigh the public interest in disclosure.

The courts have observed that preliminary materials that are not customarily discarded or that have not in fact been discarded pursuant to policy or custom must be disclosed. Records that are normally retained do not qualify for the exemption. This is in keeping with the purpose of the FOIA “memorandums” exemption of prohibiting the “secret law” that would result from confidential memos retained by local agencies to guide their decision-making.

**PRACTICE TIP:**

By adopting written policies or developing consistent practices of discarding preliminary deliberative writings, local agencies may facilitate candid internal policy debate. Consider including in such policies when a document should be considered to be “discarded,” which might prevent the need to search through bins of documents segregated and approved for destruction under the policies, yet awaiting appropriate shredding and disposal. Such policies and practices may exempt from disclosure even preliminary drafts that have not yet been discarded, so long as the drafts are not maintained by the local agency in the ordinary course of business, and the public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

**Elections**

**Voter Registration Information**

Voter registration information, including the home street address, telephone number, email address, precinct number, or other number specified by the Secretary of State for voter registration purposes is confidential and cannot be disclosed except as specified in section 2194 of the Elections Code. Similarly, the signature of the voter shown on the voter registration card is confidential and may not be disclosed to any person, except as provided in the Elections Code. Voter registration information may be provided to any candidate for federal, state, or local office; to any committee for or against an initiative or referendum measure for which legal publication is made; and to any person who requests it in writing.

---

218 5 U.S.C. § 552, subd. (b)(5).
219 *Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court*, supra, 53 Cal.3d 1325, 1339–1340.
220 *Id.* at p. 1342.
223 Gov. Code, § 7924.000, subd. (a)(1) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.4, subd. (a)).
224 Gov. Code, § 7924.000, subd. (c) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.4, subd. (d)).
for election, scholarly, journalistic, or political purposes, or for governmental purposes, as determined by the Secretary of State.\footnote{225 Elec. Code, § 2194.}

A California Driver’s License, California ID card, or other unique identifier used by the State of California for purposes of voter identification shown on the affidavit of voter registration of a registered voter or added to voter registration records to comply with the requirements of the federal Help America Vote Act of 2002, is confidential and may not be disclosed to any person.\footnote{226 Elec. Code, § 2194, subd. (b).}

When a person’s vote is challenged, the voter’s home address or signature may be released to the challenger, elections officials, and other persons as necessary to make, defend against, or adjudicate a challenge.\footnote{227 Elec. Code, § 2194, subd. (c)(1).}

A person may view the signature of a voter to determine whether the signature matches a signature on an affidavit of registration or a petition. The signature cannot be copied, reproduced, or photographed in any way.\footnote{228 Elec. Code, § 2194, subd. (c)(2).}

Information or data compiled by local agency officers or employees revealing the identity of persons who have requested bilingual ballots or ballot pamphlets is not a disclosable public record and may not be provided to any person other than those local agency officers or employees who are responsible for receiving and processing those requests.\footnote{229 Gov. Code, § 7924.005 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.6).}

\textbf{Initiative, Recall, and Referendum Petitions}

Nomination documents and signatures filed in lieu of filing fee petitions may be inspected, but not copied or distributed.\footnote{230 Elec. Code, § 17100.}

Similarly, any petition to which a voter has affixed his or her signature for a statewide, county, city, or district initiative, referendum, recall, or matters submitted under the Elections Code, is not a disclosable public record and is not open to inspection except by the local agency officers or employees whose duty it is to receive, examine, or preserve the petitions.\footnote{231 Gov. Code, § 7924.005 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.6).}

This prohibition extends to all memoranda prepared by county and city elections officials in the examination of the petitions indicating which voters have signed particular petitions.\footnote{232 Gov. Code, § 7924.110, subd. (a)(5) (formerlyGov. Code, § 6253.5, subd. (a)).}

If a petition is found to be insufficient, the proponents and their representatives may inspect the memoranda of insufficiency to determine which signatures were disqualified and the reasons for the disqualification.\footnote{233 Gov. Code, § 7924.110, subd. (b)(2) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.5, subd. (a)).}

\textbf{Identity of Informants}

A local agency also has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent another from disclosing the identity of a person who has furnished information in confidence to a law enforcement officer or representative of a local agency charged with administration or enforcement of the law alleged to be violated.\footnote{234 Evid. Code, § 1041.} This privilege applies where the information purports to disclose a violation of a federal, state, or another public entity’s law, and where the public’s interest in
protecting an informant’s identity outweighs the necessity for disclosure.\textsuperscript{235} This privilege extends to disclosure of the contents of the informant’s communication if the disclosure would tend to disclose the identity of the informant.\textsuperscript{236}

**Information Technology Systems Security Records**

An information security record is exempt from disclosure if, on the facts of a particular case, disclosure would reveal vulnerabilities to attack, or would otherwise increase the potential for an attack on a local agency’s information technology system.\textsuperscript{237}

Disclosure of records stored within a local agency’s information technology system that are not otherwise exempt under the law do not fall within this exemption.\textsuperscript{238}

**Law Enforcement Records**

**Overview**

As an exemption to the general rule of disclosure under the PRA, law enforcement records are generally exempt from disclosure to the public.\textsuperscript{239} That is, in most instances, the actual investigation files and records are themselves exempt from disclosure, but the PRA does require local agencies to disclose certain information derived from those files and records.\textsuperscript{240} For example, the names of officers involved in a police shooting are subject to disclosure, unless disclosure would endanger an officer’s safety (e.g., if there is a specific threat to an officer or an officer is working undercover).\textsuperscript{241}

The type of information that must be disclosed differs depending on whether it relates to, for example, calls to the police department for assistance, the identity of an arrestee, information relating to a traffic accident, or certain types of crimes, including car theft, burglary, or arson. The identities of victims of certain types of crimes, including minors and victims of sexual assault, are required to be withheld if requested by the victim or the victim’s guardian, if the victim is a minor.\textsuperscript{242} Those portions of any file that reflect the analysis and conclusions of the investigating officers may also be withheld.\textsuperscript{243} Certain information that may be required to be released may be withheld where the disclosure would endanger a witness or interfere with the successful completion of the investigation. These exemptions extend indefinitely, even after the investigation is closed.\textsuperscript{244}

Release practices vary by local agency. Some local agencies provide a written summary of information being disclosed, while others release reports with certain matters redacted. Other local agencies release reports upon request with no redactions except as mandated by statute. Some local agencies also release 911 tapes and booking photos, although this is not required under the PRA.\textsuperscript{245}


\textsuperscript{236} People v. Hobbs (1994) 7 Cal.4th 948, 961–962.

\textsuperscript{237} Gov. Code, § 7929.210, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.19).

\textsuperscript{238} Gov. Code, § 7929.210, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.19). See also Gov. Code, § 7929.200 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (aa)).

\textsuperscript{239} Gov. Code, § 7923.600, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code § 6254, subd. (f)); Williams v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal.4th 337, 348.


\textsuperscript{241} Long Beach Police Officers Association v. City of Long Beach (2014) 59 Cal.4th 59, 63–68.

\textsuperscript{242} Gov. Code, § 7923.615, subd. (b) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(2)).


\textsuperscript{244} Rivero v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal.App.4th 1048, 1052; Williams v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal.4th 337, 361–362; Office of the Inspector General v. Superior Court (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 695 (Office of the Attorney General has discretion to determine which investigatory records are subject to disclosure in connection with its investigations, and investigatory records in that context may include some documents that were not prepared as part of, but became subsequently relevant to, the investigation).

PRACTICE TIP:
If it is your local agency’s policy to release police reports upon request, it is helpful to establish an internal process to control the release of the identity of minors or victims of certain types of crimes, or to ensure that releasing the report would not endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or endanger the completion of the investigation.

Recent changes to the PRA have made video or audio recordings that relate to “critical incidents” available to the public within specified timeframes. A video or audio recording relates to a critical incident if it depicts an incident involving (1) the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer or (2) an incident in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officers against a person resulted in death or in great bodily injury.

Recent changes to the Penal Code have also made records related to certain types of police incidents and police misconduct available to the public, notwithstanding the law enforcement record exemption in the PRA.

PRACTICE TIP:
The term “great bodily injury” is not defined by the recent amendments to the Government Code or the Penal Code referenced above. The Penal Code does contain a definition of great bodily injury (GBI) in the context of an enhancement statute for felonies not having bodily harm as an element. Penal Code section 12022.7 defines GBI as “a significant or substantial physical injury.” Case law interpreting this section may be helpful in determining what constitutes GBI, and therefore what records are subject to release, depending on the particular facts of an injury.

State law also requires police agencies to report annually to the California Department of Justice use of force incidents that caused serious bodily injury to a civilian, among other incidents. This report may be a helpful tool in determining which incidents are subject to release for purposes of the Public Records Act.

Exempt Records
The PRA generally exempts most law enforcement records from disclosure, including, among others:

- Complaints to or investigations conducted by a local or state police agency;
- Records of intelligence information or security procedures of a local or state police agency;
- Any investigatory or security files compiled by any other local or state police agency;
- Customer lists provided to a local police agency by an alarm or security company; and
- Any investigatory or security files compiled by any state or local agency for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes.

---

246 Gov. Code, § 7923.625 (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)).
247 Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (e) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(C)).
248 See “Peace Officer Personnel Records,” p. 53.
PRACTICE TIP:
Many departments that choose not to release entire reports develop a form that can be filled out with the requisite public information.

The burden of proof is on the agency asserting the exemption and the exemptions should be narrowly construed.\textsuperscript{250}

In addition to the above categories, and notwithstanding the changes to the PRA and Penal Code making additional police records available to the public, the public interest catchall exemption may still apply to police records, if on the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.\textsuperscript{251}

Information that Must be Disclosed
Under the Public Records Act, there are four general categories of information contained in law enforcement investigatory files that must be disclosed: information which must be disclosed to victims, their authorized representatives and insurance carriers, information relating to arrestees, information relating to complaints or requests for assistance, and audio or video recordings that relate to critical incidents.

Disclosure to Victims, Authorized Representatives, and Insurance Carriers
Except where disclosure would endanger the successful completion of an investigation or a related investigation, or endanger the safety of a witness, certain information relating to specific listed crimes must be disclosed upon request to:

- A victim;
- The victim’s authorized representative;
- An insurance carrier against which a claim has been or might be made; or
- Any person suffering bodily injury, or property damage or loss.

The type of crimes listed in this subsection to which this requirement applies include arson, burglary, fire, explosion, larceny, robbery, carjacking, vandalism, vehicle theft, or a crime defined by statute.\textsuperscript{252}

The type of information that must be disclosed under this section (except where it endangers safety of witnesses or the investigation itself) includes:

- Name and address of persons involved in or witnesses to incident (other than confidential informants);
- Description of property involved;
- Date, time, and location of incident;
- All diagrams;
- Statements of parties to incident; and
- Statements of all witnesses (other than confidential informants).\textsuperscript{253}

\textsuperscript{250} Ventura County Deputy Sheriffs’ Assn. v. County of Ventura (2021) 61 Cal.App.5th 585, 592.

\textsuperscript{251} Becerra v. Superior Court (2020) 44 Cal.App.5th 897, 923-929. See “Public Interest Exception,” p.63 for a discussion of this balancing test.

\textsuperscript{252} Gov. Code, § 7923.605, subd. (a) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)).

\textsuperscript{253} Gov. Code, § 7923.605, subd. (a) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)); Buckheit v. Dennis (ND Cal. 2012) 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49062 (noting that Government Code section 6254, subd. (f) requires disclosure of certain information to a victim. Suspects are not entitled to that same information).
Local agencies may not require a victim or a victim’s authorized representative to show proof of the victim’s legal presence in the United States to obtain the information required to be disclosed to victims.\(^{254}\) However, if a local agency does require identification for a victim or authorized representative to obtain information disclosable to victims, the local agency must, at a minimum, accept a current driver’s license or identification card issued by any state in the United States, a current passport issued by the United States or a foreign government with which the United States has a diplomatic relationship, or a current Matricula Consular card.\(^{255}\)

The Vehicle Code addresses the release of traffic accident information. A law enforcement agency to whom an accident was reported is required to disclose the entire contents of a traffic accident report to persons who have a “proper interest” in the information, including, but not limited to, the driver(s) involved in the accident, or the authorized representative, guardian, or conservator of the driver(s) involved; the parent of a minor driver; any named injured person; the owners of vehicles or property damaged by the accident; persons who may incur liability as a result of the accident; and any attorney who declares under penalty of perjury that he or she represents any of the persons described above.\(^{256}\) The local enforcement agency may recover the actual cost of providing the information.

**Information Regarding Arrestees**

The PRA mandates that the following information be released pertaining to every individual arrested by the local law enforcement agency, except where releasing the information would endanger the safety of persons involved in an investigation or endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation:

- Full name and occupation of the arrestee;
- Physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height, and weight;
- Time, date, and location of arrest;
- Time and date of booking;
- Factual circumstances surrounding arrest;
- Amount of bail set;
- Time and manner of release or location where arrestee is being held; and
- All charges the arrestee is being held on, including outstanding warrants and parole or probation holds.\(^{257}\)

As previously stated, a PRA request applies only to records existing at the time of the request.\(^{258}\) It does not require a local agency to produce records that may be created in the future. Further, a local agency is not required to provide requested information in a format that the local agency does not use.

---

\(^{254}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.655 subd. (a) (formerly § 6254.30).

\(^{255}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.655 subd. (b) (formerly § 6254.30).

\(^{256}\) Veh. Code, § 20012.

\(^{257}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.610 subd. (a)-(i) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(1)).

\(^{258}\) Gov. Code, § 7922.535 subd. (a) (formerly § 6253, subd. (c)).
Local agencies are only required to disclose arrestee information pertaining to “contemporaneous” police activity.\(^{259}\) The legislature has not defined the term “contemporaneous” in the context of arrest logs, but the purpose of the disclosure requirement is “only to prevent secret arrests and provide basic law enforcement information to the press.”\(^{260}\) For example, a request for 11 or 12 month old arrest information would not serve the purpose of preventing clandestine police activity, therefore those records are exempt from disclosure.\(^{261}\)

**Complaints or Requests for Assistance**

The Penal Code provides that except as otherwise required by the criminal discovery provisions, no law enforcement officer or employee of a law enforcement agency may disclose to any arrested person, or to any person who may be a defendant in a criminal action, the address or telephone number of any person who is a victim of or witness to the alleged offense.\(^{262}\)

Subject to the restrictions imposed by the Penal Code, the following information must be disclosed relative to complaints or requests for assistance received by the law enforcement agency:

- The time, substance, and location of all complaints or requests for assistance received by the agency, and the time and nature of the response thereto;\(^{263}\)
- To the extent the crime, alleged or committed, or any other incident is recorded, the time, date, and location of occurrence, and the time and date of the report;\(^{264}\)
- The factual circumstances surrounding crime/incident;\(^{265}\)
- A general description of injuries, property, or weapons involved;\(^{266}\) and
- The names and ages of victims, except the names of victims of certain listed crimes\(^{267}\) may be withheld upon request of the victim or parent of a minor victim.\(^{268}\)

**Requests for Journalistic or Scholarly Purposes**

Where a request states, under penalty of perjury, that (1) it is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose, or for an investigative purpose by a licensed private investigator, and (2) it will not be used directly or indirectly, or furnished to another, to sell a product or service, the PRA requires the disclosure of the name and address of every individual arrested by the local agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, except for specified crimes.\(^{269}\)

---

\(^{259}\) Kinney v. Superior Court (2022) 77 Cal.App.5th 168.

\(^{260}\) Id. at pp. 180-181

\(^{261}\) Id. at p. 181

\(^{262}\) Pen. Code, § 841.5, subd. (a).

\(^{263}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.615, subd. (a)(2)(A) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (f)(2)).

\(^{264}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.615, subd. (a)(2)(B) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (f)(2)).

\(^{265}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.615, subd. (a)(2)(D) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (f)(2)).

\(^{266}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.615, subd. (a)(2)(E) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (f)(2)).

\(^{267}\) These listed crimes include various Penal Code sections which relate to topics such as sexual abuse, child abuse, hate crimes, and stalking.

\(^{268}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.615, subd. (a)(2)(C), (b) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(2)).

**Video or Audio Recordings that Relate to Critical Incidents**

Beginning on July 1, 2019, video or audio that relates to critical incidents may only be withheld under certain circumstances and timeframes.\(^{270}\)

A video or audio recording relates to a critical incident if it depicts any of the following incidents: (1) an incident involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer; or (2) an incident in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer against a person resulted in death or in great bodily injury.\(^{271}\)

Disclosure of such video or audio may be delayed for up to 45 days, during an active criminal or administrative investigation into the incident, if the agency determines that disclosure would substantially interfere with the investigation.\(^{272}\) After 45 days, and up to one year after the incident, disclosure may continue to be delayed if the agency can demonstrate that disclosure would substantially interfere with the investigation. After one year from the date of the incident, the agency may continue to delay disclosure only if the agency demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that disclosure would substantially interfere with the investigation.\(^{273}\)

If an agency delays disclosure pursuant to this clause, the agency shall promptly provide in writing to the requester the specific basis for the agency’s determination that the interest in preventing interference with an active investigation outweighs the public interest in disclosure and provide the estimated date for the disclosure. The agency shall reassess withholding and notify the requester every 30 days. A recording withheld by the agency shall be disclosed promptly when the specific basis for withholding is resolved.\(^{274}\)

Video or audio may be redacted if the agency determines that a reasonable expectation of privacy outweighs the public interest in disclosure. However, the redactions should be limited to protect those privacy interests and shall not interfere with the viewer’s ability to fully, completely, and accurately comprehend the events captured in the recording and the recording shall not otherwise be edited or altered.\(^{275}\) If protecting the privacy interest is not possible through redaction, and the privacy interest outweighs the public interest in disclosure, the agency may withhold the video or audio from the public.\(^{276}\) However, the video or audio shall be disclosed promptly, upon request, to the subject of the recording or their representative as described in the statute.\(^{277}\)

Staff time incurred in searching for, reviewing, and redacting video or audio is not chargeable to the PRA requester.\(^{278}\)

**Coroner Photographs or Video**

No copies, reproductions, or facsimiles of a photograph, negative, print, or video recording of a deceased person taken by or for the coroner (including by local law enforcement personnel) at the scene of death, or in the course of a postmortem examination or autopsy, may be disseminated except as provided by statute.\(^{279}\)

---

\(^{270}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625 (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)).

\(^{271}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (e) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(C)).

\(^{272}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (a)(1) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(A)(i)).

\(^{273}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (a)(2) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(A)(ii)).

\(^{274}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (a)(2) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(A)(ii)).

\(^{275}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (b)(1) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(B)(ii))

\(^{276}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (b)(2) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(B)(ii)).

\(^{277}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.625, subd. (b)(2)(A-C) (formerly § 6254, subd. (f)(4)(B)(i-III)).

\(^{278}\) National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 488.

\(^{279}\) Code Civ. Proc., § 129.
Automated License Plate Readers Data
Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) scan data is not considered “records of investigations” because the scans are not the result of any targeted inquiry into any particular crime or crimes.\textsuperscript{280} As such, this data is not subject to the law enforcement records exemption.

Mental Health Detention Information
All information and records obtained in the course of providing services to a mentally disordered individual who is gravely disabled or a danger to others or him or herself, and who is detained and taken into custody by a peace officer, are confidential and may only be disclosed to enumerated recipients and for the purposes specified in state law.\textsuperscript{281} Willful, knowing release of confidential mental health detention information can create liability for civil damages.\textsuperscript{282}

\textbf{PRACTICE TIP:}
All information obtained in the course of a mental health detention (often referred to as a “5150 detention”) is confidential, including information in complaint or incident reports that would otherwise be subject to disclosure under the PRA.

Elder Abuse Records
Reports of suspected abuse or neglect of an elder or dependent adult, and information contained in such reports, are confidential and may only be disclosed as permitted by state law.\textsuperscript{283} The prohibition against unauthorized disclosure applies regardless of whether a report of suspected elder abuse or neglect is from someone who has assumed full or intermittent responsibility for the care or custody of an elder or dependent adult, whether or not for compensation (a mandated reporter), or from someone else.\textsuperscript{284} Unauthorized disclosure of suspected elder abuse or neglect information is a misdemeanor.\textsuperscript{285}

Juvenile Records
Records or information gathered by law enforcement agencies relating to the detention of, or taking of, a minor into custody or temporary custody are confidential and subject to release only in certain circumstances and by certain specified persons and entities.\textsuperscript{286} Juvenile court case files are subject to inspection only by specific listed persons and are governed by both statute and state court rules.\textsuperscript{287}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{280} \textit{American Civil Liberties Union Foundation v. Superior Court} (2017) 3 Cal. 5th 1032.
\item \textsuperscript{281} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, §§ 5150, 5328.
\item \textsuperscript{282} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, § 5330.
\item \textsuperscript{283} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, § 15633.
\item \textsuperscript{284} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, § 15633.
\item \textsuperscript{285} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, §15633.
\item \textsuperscript{286} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, §§ 827, 828; see \textit{Welf & Inst. Code}, § 827.9 (applies to Los Angeles County only). See also \textit{T.N.G. v. Superior Court} (1971) 4 Cal.3d 767 (release of information regarding minor who has been temporarily detained and released without any further proceedings.)
\item \textsuperscript{287} \textit{Welf. & Inst. Code}, § 827.
\end{itemize}
Different provisions apply to dissemination of information gathered by a law enforcement agency relating to the taking of a minor into custody where it is provided to another law enforcement agency, including a school district police or security department, or other agency or person who has a legitimate need for information for purposes of official disposition of a case. In addition, a law enforcement agency must release the name of and descriptive information relating to any juvenile who has escaped from a secure detention facility.

**Child Abuse Reports**
Reports of suspected child abuse or neglect, including reports from those who are “mandated reporters,” such as teachers and public school employees and officials, physicians, children’s organizations, and community care facilities, and child abuse and neglect investigative reports that result in a summary report being filed with the Department of Justice, are confidential and may only be disclosed to the persons and agencies listed in state law. Unauthorized disclosure of confidential child abuse or neglect information is a misdemeanor.

**Library Patron Use Records**
All patron use records of any library that is supported in whole or in part by public funds are confidential and may not be disclosed except to persons acting within the scope of their duties within library administration, upon written authorization from the person whose records are sought, or by court order. The term “patron use records” includes written or electronic records that identify the patron, the patron’s borrowing information, or use of library resources, including database search records and any other personally identifiable information requests or inquiries. This exemption does not extend to statistical reports of patron use or records of fines collected by the library.

**Library Circulation Records**
Library circulation records that are kept to identify the borrowers, and library and museum materials presented solely for reference or exhibition purposes, are exempt from disclosure. Further, all registration and circulation records of any library that is (in whole or in part) supported by public funds are confidential. The confidentiality of library circulation records does not extend to records of fines imposed on borrowers.

---

288 Welf & Inst. Code, § 828, subd. (a); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.552(b).
289 Welf & Inst. Code, § 828, subd. (b).
290 Pen. Code, §§ 11165.6, 11165.7, 11167.5, 11169.
291 Pen. Code, § 11167.5, subd. (a).
295 Gov. Code, § 7927.100, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, §6254, subd. (j)).
296 Gov. Code, § 7927.105, subd. (c) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (j)).
297 Gov. Code, § 7927.100, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (j)).
Licensee Financial Information

When a local agency requires that applicants for licenses, certificates, or permits submit personal financial data, that information is exempt from disclosure.298 One frequent example of this is the submittal of sales or income information under a business license tax requirement. However, this exemption is construed narrowly and does not apply to financial information filed by an existing licensee or franchisee to justify a rate increase, because the franchisee is not merely applying for a license but is contractually assuming a city function which requires monitoring and regular review.299

Medical Records

California’s Constitution protects a person’s right to privacy in his or her medical records.300 Therefore, the PRA exempts from disclosure “personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”301 In addition, the PRA exempts from disclosure “[r]ecords, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law,”302 including, but not limited to, those described in the Confidentiality of Medical Information Act,303 physician/patient privilege,304 the Health Data and Advisory Council Consolidation Act,305 and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.306

PRACTICE TIP:

Both Gov. Code sections 7927.700 and 7927.705 probably apply to records protected under the physician/patient privilege, the Confidentiality of Medical Information Act, the Health Data and Advisory Council Consolidation Act, and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. In addition, individually identifiable health information is probably also exempt from disclosure under the “public interest” exemption in Government Code section 7922.000.

Health Data and Advisory Council Consolidation Act

Any organization that operates, conducts, owns, or maintains a health facility, hospital, or freestanding ambulatory surgery clinic must file reports with the state that include detailed patient health and financial information.307 Patient medical record numbers, and any other data elements of these reports that could be used to determine the identity of an individual patient are exempt from disclosure.308

---

298 Gov. Code, § 7925.005 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (n)).
301 Gov. Code, § 7927.700 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (c)).
302 Gov. Code, § 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (k)).
303 Civ. Code, §§ 56 et seq.
304 Evid. Code, §§ 990 et seq.
305 Health & Saf. Code, §§ 128675 et seq.
308 Health & Saf. Code, § 128745, subd. (c)(6).
Physician/Patient Privilege

Patients may refuse to disclose, and prevent others from disclosing, confidential communications between themselves and their physicians. The privilege extends to confidential patient/physician communication that is disclosed to third parties where reasonably necessary to accomplish the purpose for which the physician was consulted.

**PRACTICE TIP:**

Patient medical information provided to local agency emergency medical personnel to assist in providing emergency medical care may be subject to the physician/patient privilege if providing the privileged information is reasonably necessary to accomplish the purpose for which the physician was, or will be, consulted, including emergency room physicians.

Confidentiality of Medical Information Act

Subject to certain exceptions, health care providers, health care service plan providers, and contractors are prohibited from disclosing a patient’s individually identifiable medical information without first obtaining authorization. Employers must establish appropriate procedures to ensure the confidentiality and appropriate use of individually identifiable medical information. Local agencies that are not providers of health care, health care service plans, or contractors as defined in state law may possess individually identifiable medical information protected under state law that originated with providers of health care, health care service plans, or contractors.

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

Congress enacted the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) in 1996 to improve portability and continuity of health insurance coverage and to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in health insurance and health care delivery through the development of a health information system and establishment of standards and requirements for the electronic transmission of certain health information. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Secretary (HHS) has issued privacy regulations governing use and disclosure of individually identifiable health information by “covered entities” — essentially health plans, health care clearinghouses, and any health care provider who transmits health information in electronic form in connection with transactions for which the Secretary of HHS has adopted standards under HIPAA. Persons who knowingly and in violation of federal law use or cause to be used a unique health identifier, obtain individually identifiable health information relating to an individual, or disclose

---

310 Evid. Code, § 992.
311 Civ. Code, §§ 56.10, subd. (a); 56.05, subd. (g). “Provider of health care” as defined means persons licensed under Business & Professions Code section 500 et seq, or Health & Safety Code section 1797 and following, and clinics, health dispensaries, or health facilities licensed under Health and Safety Code section 1200 and following. “Health care service plan” as defined means entities regulated under Health & Safety Code section 1340 and following. “Contractor” as defined means medical groups, independent practice associations, pharmaceutical benefits managers, and medical service organizations that are not providers of health care or health care service plans.
312 Civ. Code, § 56.20.
313 Civ. Code, § 56.05, subd. (g).
316 Persons (including an employee or other individual) shall be considered to have obtained or disclosed individually identifiable health information in violation of this part if the information is maintained by a covered entity (as defined in the HIPAA privacy regulation described in section 1320d-9(b)(3)) and the individual obtained or disclosed such information without authorization. 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-6 (a).
individually identifiable health information to another person are subject to substantial fines and imprisonment of not more than one year, or both, and to increased fines and imprisonment for violations under false pretenses or with the intent to use individually identifiable health information for commercial advantage, personal gain, or malicious harm.\footnote{42 U.S.C. § 1320d-6.} Federal law also permits the Health and Human Services Secretary to impose civil penalties\footnote{42 U.S.C. § 1320d-5.}

**Workers’ Compensation Benefits**

Records pertaining to the workers’ compensation benefits for an individually identified employee are exempt from disclosure as “personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.”\footnote{Gov. Code, § 7927.700 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (c)).} The PRA further prohibits the disclosure of records otherwise exempt or prohibited from disclosure pursuant to federal and state law.\footnote{Gov. Code, § 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (k)).} State law prohibits a person or public or private entity who is not a party to a claim for workers’ compensation benefits from obtaining individually identifiable information obtained or maintained by the Division of Workers’ Compensation on that claim.\footnote{Lab. Code, § 138.7, subd. (a). This state statute defines “individually identifiable information” to mean “any data concerning an injury or claim that is linked to a uniquely identifiable employee, employer, claims administrator, or any other person or entity.”} Certain information may be subject to disclosure once an application for adjudication has been filed.\footnote{Lab. Code, §§ 5501.5, 138.7.} If the request relates to pre-employment screening, the administrative director must notify the person about whom the information is requested and include a warning about discrimination against persons who have filed claims for workers’ compensation benefits. Further, a residential address cannot be disclosed, except to law enforcement agencies, the district attorney, other governmental agencies, or for journalistic purposes. Individually identifiable information is not subject to subpoena in a civil proceeding without notice and a hearing at which the court is required to balance the respective interests — privacy and public disclosure. Individually identifiable information may be used for certain types of statistical research by specifically listed persons and entities.\footnote{Lab Code, §138.7.}

**Official Information Privilege**

A local agency may refuse to disclose official information.\footnote{Lab Code, §138.7.} “Official information” is statutorily defined as “information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made.”\footnote{Evid. Code, § 1040, subd. (a).} However, the courts have somewhat expanded on the statutory definition by determining that certain types of information, such as police investigative files and medical information, are “by [their] nature confidential and widely treated as such” and thus protected from disclosure by the privilege.\footnote{Department of Motor Vehicles v. Superior Court (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 363, 373–374.} Therefore, “official information” includes information that is protected by a state or federal statutory

The local agency has the right to assert the official information privilege both to refuse to disclose and to prevent another from disclosing official information.\textsuperscript{328}

Where the disclosure is prohibited by state or federal statute, the privilege is absolute, unless there is an exception.\textsuperscript{329}

In all other respects, it is conditional and requires a judge to weigh the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of information against the necessity for disclosure in the interest of justice.\textsuperscript{330} This is similar to the weighing process provided for in the PRA — allowing nondisclosure when the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure.\textsuperscript{331} As part of the weighing process a court will look at the consequences to the public, including the effect of the disclosure on the integrity of public processes and procedures.\textsuperscript{332} This is typically done through \textit{in camera} judicial review.\textsuperscript{333}

There are a number of cases interpreting this statute.\textsuperscript{334} While many of the cases interpreting this privilege involve law enforcement records, other cases arise out of licensing and accreditation-type activities. The courts address these types of cases on an individualized basis and further legal research should be done within the context of particular facts.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{PRACTICE TIP:}
  
  Although there is no case law directly on point, this privilege, along with the informant privilege, may be asserted to protect the identities of code enforcement complainants and whistleblowers.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Pending Litigation or Claims}

The PRA exempts from disclosure records pertaining to pending litigation to which the public agency is a party, or to claims made pursuant to the California Government Claims Act, until the pending litigation or claim has been finally adjudicated or otherwise settled.\textsuperscript{335} Although the phrase “pertaining to” pending litigation or claims might seem broad, the courts nevertheless have construed the exemption narrowly, consistent with the underlying policy of the PRA to promote access to public records. Therefore, the claim itself is not exempt from disclosure — the exemption applies only to documents specifically prepared by, or at the direction of, the local agency for use in existing or anticipated litigation.\textsuperscript{336}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{328} Evid. Code, § 1040, subd. (b).
  \item \textsuperscript{329} See Evid. Code § 1040, subd. (c) (notwithstanding any other law, the Employment Development Department shall disclose to law enforcement agencies, in accordance with subdivision (i) of Section 1095 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, information in its possession relating to any person if an arrest warrant has been issued for the person for commission of a felony).
  \item \textsuperscript{330} See also exception in Evid. Code § 1040, subd. (c).
  \item \textsuperscript{331} Gov. Code, § 7927.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255).
  \item \textsuperscript{332} Shepherd v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal.3d 107, 126.
  \item \textsuperscript{333} The term "\textit{in camera}" refers to a review of the document in the judge’s chambers outside the presence of the requesting party.
  \item \textsuperscript{335} Gov. Code, § 7927.200 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (b)).
\end{itemize}
It may sometimes be difficult to determine whether a particular record was prepared specifically for use in litigation or for other purposes related to the underlying incident. For example, an incident report may be prepared either in anticipation of defending a potential claim, or simply for risk management purposes. In order for the exemption to apply, the local agency would have to prove that the dominant purpose of the record was to be used in defense of litigation.  

Attorney billing invoices reflecting work in active and ongoing litigation are exempt from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege or attorney work product doctrine. The Supreme Court reasoned that the content of such invoices is so closely related to attorney-client communications that its disclosure may reveal legal strategy or consultation. Once a matter is concluded, however, portions of attorney invoices reflecting fee totals (not billing entries or portions of invoices that describe the work performed for a client) must be disclosed unless such totals reveal anything about the legal consultation such as insight into litigation strategy, the substance of the legal consultation, or clues about legal strategy. This is a factual analysis that weighs various factors.

It is important to remember that even members of the public that have filed a claim against or sued a local agency are entitled to use the PRA to obtain documents that may be relevant to the claim or litigation. The mere fact that the person might also be able to obtain the documents in discovery is not a ground for rejecting the request under the PRA.

The pending litigation exemption does not prevent members of the public from obtaining records submitted to the local agency pertaining to existing or anticipated litigation, such as a claim for monetary damages filed prior to a lawsuit, because the records were not prepared by the local agency. Moreover, while medical records are subject to a constitutional right of privacy, and generally exempt from production under the PRA and other statutes, an individual may be deemed to have waived the right to confidentiality by submitting medical records to the public entity in order to obtain a settlement.

Once the claim or litigation is no longer “pending,” records previously shielded from disclosure by the exemption must be produced, unless covered by another exemption. For example, the public may obtain copies of depositions from closed cases and documents concerning the settlement of a claim that are not shielded from disclosure by other exemptions. Exemptions that may be used to withhold documents from disclosure after the claim or litigation is no longer pending include the exemptions for law enforcement investigative reports, medical records, and attorney-client privileged records and attorney work product. Particular records or information relevant to settlement of a closed claim or case may also be subject to nondisclosure under the public interest exemption to the extent the local agency can show the public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

342 See “Medical Records,” p. 46.
PRACTICE TIP:

In responding to a request for documents concerning settlement of a particular matter, it is critical to pay close attention to potential application of other exemptions under the PRA. Additionally, if the settlement is approved by the legislative body during a closed session, release of the settlement documents are governed by the Brown Act. It is recommended that you seek the advice of your local agency counsel.

There is considerable overlap between the pending litigation exemption and both the attorney-client privilege and attorney-work-product doctrine. However, the exemption for pending litigation is not limited solely to documents that fall within either the attorney-client privilege or attorney-work-product doctrine. Moreover, while the exemption for pending litigation expires once the litigation is no longer pending, the attorney-client privilege and attorney-work-product doctrine continue indefinitely.

Personal Contact Information

Court decisions have ruled that individuals have a substantial privacy interest in their personal contact information. However, a fact-specific analysis must be conducted to determine whether the public interest exemption protects this information from disclosure, i.e., whether the public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Application of this balancing test has yielded varying results, depending on the circumstances of the case.

For example, courts have allowed nondisclosure of the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of airport noise complainants. In that instance, the anticipated chilling effect on future citizen complaints weighed heavily in the court’s decision. On the other hand, the courts have ordered disclosure of information contained in applications for licenses to carry firearms, except for information that indicates when or where the applicant is vulnerable to attack or that concern the applicant’s medical or psychological history or that of members of his or her family. Courts have also ordered disclosure of the names and addresses of residential water customers who exceeded their water allocation under a rationing ordinance, and the names of donors to a university affiliated foundation, even though those donors had requested anonymity.

PRACTICE TIP:

In situations where personal contact information clearly cannot be kept confidential, inform the affected members of the public that their personal contact information is subject to disclosure under the PRA.

---

350 City of Los Angeles v. Superior Court, supra, 41 Cal.App.4th 1083, 1087.
351 Roberts v. City of Palmdale (1993) 5 Cal.4th 363, 373 (attorney-client privilege); Fellows v. Superior Court (1980) 108 Cal.App.3d 55, 61–63 (work-product doctrine); Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Superior Court, supra, 47 Cal.4th 725. But see Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors v. Superior Court (2016) 2 Cal.5th 282 (holding that the attorney-client privilege protects the confidentiality of invoices for work in pending and active legal matters, but that the privilege may not encompass invoices for legal matters that concluded long ago).
352 Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255, subd. (a)).
353 City of San Jose v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 1008, 1012.
354 Gov. Code, § 7923.800 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (a)(1)).
Postng Personal Contact Information of Elected/Appointed Officials on the Internet

The PRA prohibits a state or local agency from posting on the Internet the home address or telephone number of any elected or appointed officials without first obtaining their written permission. The prohibition against posting home addresses and telephone numbers of elected or appointed officials on the Internet does not apply to a comprehensive database of property-related information maintained by a state or local agency that may incidentally contain such information, where the officials are not identifiable as such from the data, and the database is only transmitted over a limited-access network, such as an intranet, extranet, or virtual private network, but not the Internet.

The PRA also prohibits someone from knowingly posting on the Internet the home address or telephone number of any elected or appointed official, or the official’s “residing spouse” or child, and either threatening or intending to cause imminent great bodily harm. Similarly, the PRA prohibits soliciting, selling, or trading on the Internet the home address or telephone number of any elected or appointed official with the intent of causing imminent great bodily harm to the official or a person residing at the official’s home address.

In addition, the PRA prohibits a person, business, or association from publicly posting or displaying on the Internet the home address or telephone number of any elected or appointed official where the official has made a written demand to the person, business, or association not to disclose his or her address or phone number.

Personnel Records

The PRA exempts from disclosure “[p]ersonnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” In addition, the public interest exemption may protect certain personnel records from disclosure. In determining whether to allow access to personnel files, the courts have determined that the tests under each exemption are essentially the same: the extent of the local agency employee’s privacy interest in certain information and the harm from its unwarranted disclosure is weighed against the public interest in disclosure. The public interest in disclosure will be considered in the context of the extent to which the disclosure of the information will shed light on the local agency’s performance of its duties.

Decisions from the California Supreme Court have determined that local agency employees do not have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their name, salary information, and dates of employment. This interpretation also applies to police officers absent unique, individual circumstances.

357 See Gov. Code, § 7920.500 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.21, subd. (f)) (containing a non-exhaustive list of individuals who qualify as “elected or appointed official[s]”).
359 Gov. Code, § 7928.210 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.21, subd. (b)).
360 Gov. Code, § 7928.230 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.21, subd. (d)).
361 See Gov. Code, §§ 7928.215-7928.225 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.21, subd. (c)).
362 Gov. Code, § 7920.520 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (c)).
365 International Fed’n of Prof. & Tech. Eng’rs, Local 21, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court, supra, 42 Cal.4th 319, 327; Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training v. Superior Court, supra, 42 Cal.4th 278, 289–293.
In situations involving allegations of non-law enforcement local agency employee misconduct, courts have considered the following factors in determining whether disclosure of employment investigation reports or related records would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy:

- Are the allegations of misconduct against a high-ranking public official or a local agency employee in a position of public trust and responsibility (e.g., teachers, public safety employees, employees who work with children)?
- Are the allegations of misconduct of a substantial nature or trivial?
- Were findings of misconduct sustained or was discipline imposed?

Courts have upheld the public interest against disclosure of “trivial or groundless” charges. In contrast, when “the charges are found true, or discipline is imposed,” the public interest likely favors disclosure. In addition, “where there is reasonable cause to believe the complaint to be well founded, the right of public access to related public records exists.” However, even if the local agency employee is exonerated of wrongdoing, disclosure may be warranted if the allegations of misconduct involve a high-ranking public official or local agency employee in a position of public trust and responsibility, given the public’s interest in understanding why the employee was exonerated and how the local agency employer treated the accusations.

With respect to personnel investigation reports, although the PRA’s personnel exemption may not exempt such a report from disclosure, the attorney-client privilege or attorney-work-product doctrine may apply. Further, discrete portions of the personnel report may still be exempt from disclosure and redacted, such as medical information contained in a report or the names of third-party witnesses.

The courts have permitted persons who believe their rights may be infringed by a local agency decision to disclose records to bring a “reverse PRA action” to seek an order preventing disclosure of the records.

**Peace Officer Personnel Records**

With certain exceptions under Penal Code section 832.7, peace officer personnel records, including internal affairs investigation reports regarding alleged misconduct, are both confidential and privileged. Records outside of these certain exemptions fall within the category of records, “the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law ....” Records of an independent investigation into a complaint of alleged harassment by an elected county sheriff, including the complaint and the report, are not protected peace officer personnel records.
under Section 6254(k) of the PRA, or Sections 832.7 and 832.8 of the Penal Code, or protected citizen complaint records under Section 832.5 of the Penal Code, because an elected sheriff is not an employee of the county, but rather accountable directly to the county voters.  

Except as discussed below, the discovery and disclosure of the personnel records of peace officers are governed exclusively by statutory provisions contained in the Evidence Code and Penal Code. Peace officer personnel records and records of citizen complaints “...or information obtained from these records...” are confidential and “shall not” be disclosed in any criminal or civil proceeding except by discovery pursuant to statutorily prescribed procedures. The appropriate procedure for obtaining information in the protected peace officer personnel files is to file a motion commonly known as a “Pitchess” motion, which by statute entails a two-part process involving first a determination by the court regarding good cause and materiality of the information sought and a subsequent confidential review by the court of the files, where warranted.  

Notwithstanding the general confidentiality of peace officer personnel records or the law enforcement records exemption under the PRA, agencies must release all records, including investigative reports, related to certain incidents or allegations. These include:

- Records relating to the reports, investigations, or findings regarding an incident involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by an officer.
- Records relating to the reports, investigations, or findings regarding an incident involving the use of force against a person by an officer that resulted in death or great bodily injury.
- Records relating to a sustained finding that an officer used unreasonable or excessive force.
- Records relating to a sustained finding that an officer failed to intervene against another officer using force that is clearly unreasonable or excessive.
- Records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency that an officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the public.
- Records relating to a sustained finding of dishonesty by an officer related to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or directly related to the reporting or investigation of misconduct by another officer.
- Records relating to a sustained finding that an officer engaged in conduct involving prejudice or discrimination against a person based on a protected status, as listed in the statute.

---

376 Pen. Code, § 832.7; Evid. Code, §§ 1043, 1046.
378 Pen. Code § 832.7 subd. (b)(3).
• Records relating to a sustained finding that an officer made an unlawful arrest or conducted an unlawful search.386

For purposes of disclosure, a finding is “sustained” if there has been a final determination that the actions of the peace officer or custodial officer violated law or department policy following an investigation and opportunity for an administrative appeal pursuant to Sections 3304 and 3304.5 of the Government Code.387

While some of the exceptions to the general confidentiality provisions were enacted effective January 1, 2019, the statute applies retroactively, even to those incidents that occurred prior to 2019.388

An agency is required to disclose non-confidential police records retained by the agency, regardless of whether the agency prepared, owned, or used the records.389

In general, records subject to disclosure under Penal Code section 832.7 subdivision (b) shall be provided at the earliest possible time and no later than 45 days from the date of a request for their disclosure.390 However, disclosure may be delayed based on specified circumstances, where there is an active criminal or administrative investigation.391

Unless the agency determines that disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with a criminal enforcement proceeding against an officer or someone else, the time to provide the records can only be extended to 60 days.392

If disclosure would reasonably be expected to interfere with criminal enforcement, the disclosure can be delayed up to 60 days, the agency must provide a written determination that includes the basis for its determination and the estimated date of disclosure.393 This written determination must be renewed every 180 days.394 Under no circumstances can disclosure be delayed for more than 18 months.395

In addition, there are other procedural and substantive requirements regarding records that are subject to disclosure under Penal Code section 832.7(b), as follows:

- If the incident is subject to disclosure, records relating to an incomplete investigation must be disclosed if a peace officer resigned during the investigation.396
- Records from separate or prior investigations shall not be released unless they are independently subject to disclosure.397
- For investigations or incidents that involve multiple officers, care should be given to follow the statutory requirements for portions that may be released and those that must remain confidential.398

---

386 Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(1)(C).
387 Pen. Code, § 832.8, subd. (b). See also Collondrez v. City of Rio Vista (2021) 61 Cal.App.5th 1039 (Officer had an opportunity for administrative appeal but settled and withdrew the appeal; the disciplinary decision was subject to disclosure as a final determination with a sustained finding).
390 Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(11).
391 Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(8).
392 Ibid.
393 Ibid.
394 Ibid.
395 Ibid.
396 Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(3).
397 Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(4).
398 Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(5).
Redactions are limited to certain listed purposes only. For example, the identity of whistleblowers, complainants, victims, and witnesses are required to remain confidential.

The local agency may charge only the direct cost of duplication for the production of these records and may not charge for searching or redacting records.

Attorney-client privilege will not prohibit the disclosure of factual information provided by the local agency to its attorney, or factual information discovered in any investigation conducted by, or on behalf of, the local agency’s attorney. Additionally, the privilege will not cover attorney billing records unless the records relate to a legal consultation between the local agency and its attorney in active and ongoing litigation.

Prior to hiring a lateral police officer, the hiring agency must review any investigations of misconduct maintained by the officer’s current or prior employer.

Although the PRA is not a retention statute, Penal Code section 832.7 requires that records with no sustained finding of misconduct be retained for at least five years and records related to sustained misconduct must be retained for a minimum of 15 years.

Confidential peace officer personnel files are not protected from disclosure when the district attorney, attorney general, or grand jury are investigating the conduct of the officers. The other notable exception arises where an officer publishes factual information concerning a disciplinary action that is known by the officer to be false. If the information is published in the media, the employing agency may disclose factual information about the discipline to refute the employee’s false statements.

Peace officer “personnel records” include personal data, medical history, appraisals, and discipline; complaints and investigations relating to events perceived by the officer or relating to the manner in which his or her duties were performed; and any other information the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. The names, salary information, and employment dates and departments of peace officers have been determined to be disclosable records absent unique circumstances. Additionally, official service photographs of peace officers are subject to disclosure and are not exempt or privileged as personnel records unless disclosure would pose an unreasonable risk of harm to the peace officer. The names of officers involved in a police shooting are subject to disclosure, unless disclosure would endanger an officer’s safety (e.g., if there is a specific threat to an officer or an
officer is working undercover). Video captured by a dashboard camera is not a personnel record protected from disclosure.

While the Penal and Evidence Code privileges are not per se applicable in federal court, federal common law does recognize a qualified privilege for “official information” and considers government personnel files to be “official information.” Moreover, independent reports regarding officer-involved shootings are not exempt from disclosure, though portions of the report culled from personnel information or officers’ statements made in the course of an internal affairs investigation of the shooting are protected and may be redacted from the report. Such a qualified privilege in federal court results in a very similar weighing of the potential benefits of disclosure against potential disadvantages.

**Employment Contracts, Employee Salaries, & Pension Benefits**

Every employment contract between a local agency and any public official or local agency employee is a public record which is not subject to either the personnel exemption or the public interest exemption. Thus, for example, one court has held that two letters in a city firefighter’s personnel file were part of his employment contract and could not be withheld under either the local agency employee’s right to privacy in his personnel file or the public interest exemption.

With or without an employment contract, the names and salaries (including performance bonuses and overtime) of local agency employees, including peace officers, are subject to disclosure under the PRA. Public employees do not have a reasonable expectation that their salaries will remain a private matter. In addition, there is a strong public interest in knowing how the government spends its money. Therefore, absent unusual circumstances, the names and salaries of local agency employees are not subject to either the personnel exemption or the public interest exemption.

In addition, the courts have held that local agencies are required to disclose the identities of pensioners and the amount of pension benefits received by such pensioners, reasoning that the public interest in disclosure of the names of pensioners and data concerning the amounts of their pension benefits outweighs any privacy interests the pensioners may have in such information. On the other hand, the courts have found that personal information provided to a retirement system by a member or on a member’s behalf, such as a member’s personal email address, home address, telephone number, social security number, birthday, age at retirement, benefits election, and health

---

409 Long Beach Police Officers Ass’n v. City of Long Beach (2014) 59 Cal.4th 59, 75; 91 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 11 (2008) (the names of peace officers involved in critical incidents, such as ones involving lethal force, are not categorically exempt from disclosure, however, the balancing test may be applied under the specific factual circumstances of each case to weigh the public interests at stake).


414 Gov. Code, § 7928.400 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.8); Gov. Code, § 53262, subd. (b).


416 International Fed’n of Prof. & Tech. Eng’rs, Local 21, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court, supra, 42 Cal.4th 3 at p. 327.

417 Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training v. Superior Court, supra, 42 Cal.4th 278, 299, 303.

reports concerning the member, to be exempt from disclosure under the PRA. With regard to the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS), the identities of and amount of benefits received by CalPERS pensioners are subject to public disclosure.

**PRACTICE TIP:**
If a member of the public requests information regarding CalPERS from a local agency, make sure to check the terms of any agreement that may exist between the agency and CalPERS for confidentiality requirements.

**Contractor Payroll Records**
State law establishes requirements for maintaining and disclosing certified payroll records for workers employed on public works projects subject to payment of prevailing wages. State law requires contractors to make certified copies of payroll records available to employees and their representatives, representatives of the awarding body, the Department of Industrial Relations, and the public. Requests are to be made through the awarding agency or the Department of Industrial Relations, and the requesting party is required to reimburse the cost of preparation to the contractor, subcontractors, and the agency through which the request is made prior to being provided the records. Contractors are required to file certified copies of the requested records with the requesting entity within ten days after receipt of a written request.

However, state law also limits access to contractor payroll records. Employee names, addresses, and social security numbers must be redacted from certified payroll records provided to the public or any local agency by the awarding body or the Department of Industrial Relations. Only the social security numbers are to be redacted from certified payroll records provided to joint labor-management committees established pursuant to the federal Labor Management Cooperation Act of 1978. The name and address of the contractor or subcontractor may not be redacted.

The Department of Industrial Relations Director has adopted regulations governing release of certified payroll records and applicable fees. The regulations: (1) require that requests for certified payroll records be in writing and contain certain specified information regarding the awarding body, the contract, and the contractor; (2) require awarding

---

421 Lab. Code, § 1776.
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424 Contractors and subcontractors that fail to do so may be subject to a penalty of $25 per worker for each calendar day until compliance is achieved. Lab. Code, §1776, subds. (d) & (g).
426 Lab. Code, § 1776, subd. (e).
427 Lab. Code, § 1776, subd. (e).
428 Lab. Code, § 1776, subd. (i); see Lab. Code, § 16400 et seq.
Test Questions and Other Examination Data

The PRA exempts from disclosure test questions, scoring keys, and other examination data used to administer a licensing examination, examination for employment, or academic examination, except as provided in the portions of the Education Code that relate to standardized tests. Thus, for example, a local agency is not required to disclose the test questions it uses for its employment examinations. State law provides that standardized test subjects may, within 90 days after the release of test results to the test subject, have limited access to test questions and answers upon request to the test sponsor. This limited access may be either through an in-person examination or by release of certain information to the test subject. The Education Code also requires that test sponsors prepare and submit certain reports regarding standardized tests and test results to the California Postsecondary Education Commission. All such reports and information submitted to the Commission are public records subject to disclosure under the PRA.

Public Contracting Documents

Contracts with local agencies are generally disclosable public records, and the public has an interest in knowing whether public resources are being spent for the benefit of the community as a whole or the benefit of only a limited few. When the bids or proposals leading up to the contract become disclosable depends largely upon the type of contract.

Local agencies may award certain types of contracts (for example, contracts for the construction of public works, and for the procurement of goods and non-professional services) to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder through a competitive bidding process. Local agencies usually receive bids for these contracts under seal and then publicly open the bids at a designated time and place. These bids are public records and disclosable as soon as they are opened.

Other local agency contracts (for example, for acquisition of professional services or disposition of property) may be awarded to the successful proposer who is identified through a competitive proposal process. As part of this process, local agencies solicit proposals, evaluate them, and then negotiate with the “winning” proposer. While the public has a strong interest in scrutinizing the process leading to the selection of the winning proposer, a local agency’s interest in keeping these proposals confidential frequently outweighs the public’s interest in disclosure until negotiations with the winning proposer are complete. Disclosing the details of all the competing proposals can interfere with the local agency’s selection process and impair its ability to secure the best possible deal on its constituents’ behalf.

429 8 C.C.R. §§ 16400, 16402.
430 Gov. Code, § 7929.605 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (g)).
432 Ed. Code, §§ 99157, subds. (a) & (b).
433 Ed. Code, §§ 99153, 99154.
434 Ed. Code, § 99162.
Some local agencies pre-qualify prospective bidders through a request for qualifications process. The pre-qualification packages submitted, including questionnaire answers and financial statements, are exempt from disclosure. Nevertheless, documents containing the names of contractors applying for pre-qualification status are public records and must be disclosed. In addition, the contents of pre-qualification packages may be disclosed to third parties during the verification process, in an investigation of substantial allegations or at an appeal hearing.

**PRACTICE TIP:**
Local agencies should clearly advise bidders and proposers in their Requests for Bids and Requests for Proposals what bid and proposal documents will be disclosable public records and when they will be disclosable to the public.

**Real Estate Appraisals and Engineering Evaluations**

The PRA requires the disclosure of the contents of real estate appraisals, or engineering or feasibility estimates, and evaluations made for or by a local agency relative to the acquisition of property, or to prospective public supply and construction contracts, but only when all of the property has been acquired or when agreement on all terms of the contract have been obtained. By its plain terms, this exemption only applies while the acquisition or prospective contract is pending. Once all the property is acquired or agreement on all terms of the contract have been obtained, the exemption will not apply. In addition, this exemption is not intended to supersede the law of eminent domain. Thus, for example, this exemption would not apply to appraisals of owner-occupied residential property of four units or less, where disclosure of such appraisals is required by the Eminent Domain Law or related laws such as the California Relocation Assistance Act.

**PRACTICE TIP:**
If the exemption for real estate appraisals and engineering evaluations does not clearly apply, consider whether the facts of the situation justify withholding the record under Government Code section 7922.000.

**Recipients of Public Assistance**

The PRA does not require disclosure of certain types of information related to those who are receiving public assistance. For example, disclosure of information regarding food stamp recipients is prohibited. Subject to certain exceptions, disclosure of certain confidential information pertaining to applicants for or recipients of public social services for any purpose unconnected with the administration of the welfare department also is prohibited.

440 Gov. Code, § 7928.705. (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (h)).
441 Gov. Code, § 7928.705. (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (h)).
442 Gov. Code, § 7267.2, subd. (c).
443 Welf. & Inst. Code, § 18909.
444 Welf. & Inst. Code, § 10850. See also Jonon v. Superior Court (1979) 93 Cal.App.3d 683, 690 (rejecting claim that all information received by a welfare agency was privileged).
Leases and lists or rosters of tenants of the Housing Authority are confidential and must not be open to inspection by the public, but must be supplied to the respective governing body on request.\(^ {445}\) A Housing Authority has a duty to make available public documents and records of the Authority for inspection, except any applications for eligibility and occupancy which are submitted by prospective or current tenants of the Authority.\(^ {446}\)

The PRA exempts from disclosure records of the residence address of any person contained in the records of the Department of Housing and Community Development, if the person has requested confidentiality of that information in accordance with section 18081 of the Health and Safety Code.\(^ {447}\)

**Taxpayer Information**

Where information that is required from any taxpayer in connection with the collection of local taxes is received in confidence and where the disclosure of that information would result in unfair competitive disadvantage to the person supplying the information, the information is exempt from disclosure.\(^ {448}\) Sales and use tax records may be used only for administration of the tax laws. Unauthorized disclosure or use of confidential information contained in these records can give rise to criminal liability.\(^ {449}\)

\[\text{PRACTICE TIP:} \]

Make sure to check your local agency’s codes and ordinances with respect to local taxes when determining what information submitted by the taxpayer is confidential.

**Trade Secrets and Other Proprietary Information**

As part of the award and administration of public contracts, businesses will often give local agencies information that the businesses would normally consider to be proprietary. There are three exemptions that businesses often use to attempt to protect this proprietary information — the official information privilege, the trade secret privilege, and the public interest exemption.\(^ {450}\)

However, California’s strong public policy in favor of disclosure of public records precludes local agencies from protecting most business information. Both the official information privilege and the public interest exemption require that the public interest in nondisclosure outweigh the public interest in disclosure. While these provisions were designed to protect legitimate privacy interests, California courts have consistently held that when individuals or businesses voluntarily enter into the public sphere, they diminish their privacy interests.\(^ {451}\) Courts have further found that the public interest in disclosure overrides alleged privacy interests. For example, a court ordered a university to release the names of anonymous contributors who received license agreements for luxury suites at the school’s sports arena. Another court ordered a local agency to release a waste disposal contractor’s private financial statements used by the local agency to approve a rate increase.\(^ {452}\)

---

\(^ {445}\) Health & Saf. Code, § 34283.

\(^ {446}\) Health & Saf. Code, § 34332, subd. (c).


\(^ {448}\) Gov. Code, § 7925.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (i)); see also Rev. & Tax. Code, § 7056.

\(^ {449}\) Rev. & Tax. Code, §§ 7056, 7056.5.


\(^ {452}\) Cal. State Univ., Fresno Ass’n, Inc. v. Superior Court, supra, 90 Cal.App.4th 810; San Gabriel Tribune v. Superior Court, supra, 143 Cal.App.3d 762.
The trade secret privilege is for information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or process, that: (1) derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to the public or to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use; and (2) is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.453

However, even when records contain trade secrets, local agencies must determine whether disclosing the information is in the public interest. When businesses give local agencies proprietary information, courts will examine whether disclosure of that information serves the public interest.454

The PRA contains several exemptions that address specific types of information that are in the nature of trade secrets, including pesticide safety and efficacy information,455 air pollution data,456 and corporate siting information (financial records or proprietary information provided to government agencies in connection with retaining, locating, or expanding a facility within California).457

Other exemptions cover types of information that could include but are not limited to trade secrets — for example, certain information on plant production, utility systems development data, and market or crop reports.458

➤ PRACTICE TIP:

Issues concerning trade secrets and proprietary information tend to be complex and fact specific. Consider seeking the advice of your local agency counsel in determining whether records requested are exempt from disclosure.

Utility Customer Information

Personal information expressly protected from disclosure under the PRA includes names, credit histories, usage data, home addresses, and telephone numbers of local agencies’ utility customers.459 This exception is not absolute, and customers’ names, utility usage data, and home addresses may be disclosable under certain scenarios. For example, disclosure is required when requested by a customer’s agent or authorized family member,460 or an officer or employee of another governmental agency when necessary for performance of official duties,461 by court order or request of a law enforcement agency relative to an ongoing investigation,462 when the local agency determines the

453 Civ. Code, § 3426.1, subd. (d). This trade secret definition is set forth in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (“UTSA”). However, Civil Code section 3426.7, subd. (c) states that any determination as to whether disclosure of a record under the Act constitutes a misappropriation of a trade secret shall be made pursuant to the law in effect before the operative date of the UTSA. At that time, California used the Restatement definition of a trade secret, which was lengthy. See Uribe v. Howie (1971) 19 Cal.App.3d 194. Accordingly, it is not clear that the trade secret definition that applies generally under the UTSA is the trade secret definition that applies in the context of a public records request.


458 Gov. Code, § 7924.305, subd. (d) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (e)).


460 Gov. Code, § 7927.410, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6554.16, subd. (a)).

461 Gov. Code, § 7927.410, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.16, subd. (b)).

462 Gov. Code, § 7927.410, subd. (c) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.16, subd. (c)).
customer used utility services in violation of utility policies, or if the local agency determines the public interest in disclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in nondisclosure.

Utility customers who are local agency elected or appointed officials with authority to determine their agency’s utilities usage policies have lesser protection of their personal information because their names and usage data are disclosable upon request.

**Public Interest Exemption**

The PRA establishes a “public interest” or “catchall” exemption that permits local agencies to withhold a record if the agency can demonstrate that, on the facts of the particular case, the public interest served by not making the record public clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record. Weighing the public interest in nondisclosure and the public interest in disclosure under the public interest exemption is often described as a balancing test. The PRA does not specifically identify the public interests that might be served by not making the record public under the public interest exemption, but the nature of those interests may be inferred from specific exemptions contained in the PRA. The scope of the public interest exemption is not limited to specific categories of information or established exemptions or privileges. Each request for records must be considered on the facts of the particular case in light of the competing public interests.

The records and situations to which the public interest exemption may apply are open-ended and, when it applies, the public interest exemption alone is sufficient to justify nondisclosure of local agency records. The courts have relied exclusively on the public interest exemption to uphold nondisclosure of:

- Local agency records containing names, addresses, and phone numbers of airport noise complainants;
- Proposals to lease airport land prior to conclusion of lease negotiations;
- Information kept in a public defender’s database about police officers; and
- Individual teacher test scores, identified by name, designed to measure each teacher’s effect on student performance on standardized tests.

The public interest exemption is versatile and flexible, in keeping with its purpose of addressing circumstances not foreseen by the Legislature. For example, in one case, the court held local agencies could properly consider the burden of segregating exempt from nonexempt records when applying the balancing test under the public interest exemption. In that case, the court held that the substantial burden of redacting exempt information from law enforcement intelligence records outweighed the marginal and speculative benefit of disclosing the remaining nonexempt information. In another case, the court applied the balancing test to the time of disclosure to hold that
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463 Gov. Code, § 7927.410, subd. (d) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.16, subd. (d)).
464 Gov. Code, § 7927.410, subd. (f) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.16, subd. (f)).
465 Gov. Code, § 7927.410, subd. (e) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.16, subd. (e)).
468 Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court, supra, 53 Cal.3d at p. 1338.
public disclosure of competing proposals for leasing city airport property could properly await conclusion of the negotiation process.\footnote{471 Michaelis, Montanari & Johnson v. Superior Court, supra, 38 Cal.4th 1065.}

The requirement that the public interest in nondisclosure must “clearly outweigh” the public interest in disclosure for records to qualify as exempt under the public interest exemption is important and emphasized by the courts. Justifying nondisclosure under the public interest exemption demands a clear overbalance on the side of confidentiality.\footnote{472 Black Panther Party v. Kehoe (1974) 42 Cal.App.3d 645, 657.} Close calls usually do not qualify for an exemption. There are a number of examples of cases where a clear overbalance was not present to support nondisclosure under the public interest exemption. The courts have held that the following are all subject to disclosure under the public interest exemption balancing test:

- The identities of individuals granted criminal conviction exemptions to work in licensed day care facilities and the facilities employing them;
- Records relating to unpaid state warrants;
- Court records of a settlement between the insurer for a school district and a minor sexual assault victim;
- Applications for concealed weapons permits;
- Letters appointing then rescinding an appointment to a local agency position;
- The identities and license agreements of purchasers of luxury suites in a university arena; and

The public interest exemption balancing test weighs only public interests — the public interest in disclosure and the public interest in nondisclosure. Agency interests or requester interests that are not also public interests are not considered.\footnote{474 Coronado Police Officers Assn. v. Carroll (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 1001, 1015–1016.} For example, the courts have held that the public’s interest in information regarding peace officers retained in a database by the public defender in the representation of its clients is slight, and the private interests of the requesters (the police officers listed in the database) were not to be considered in determining whether the database was exempt from disclosure.\footnote{475 Ibid.}
Judicial Review and Remedies

Overview
The PRA establishes an expedited judicial process to resolve disputes over the public’s right to inspect or receive copies of public records. In contrast to other governmental transparency laws, such as the Brown Act, the PRA establishes no criminal penalties for a local agency’s noncompliance. Rather, the PRA is enforced primarily through an expedited civil judicial process in which any person may ask a judge to enforce their right to inspect or to receive a copy of any public record or class of public records. Whether the PRA provides the exclusive judicial remedy for resolving a claim that a local agency has unlawfully refused to disclose a particular record or class of records remains unresolved. This chapter discusses the special rules that apply to lawsuits brought to enforce the PRA.

The Trial Court Process
Under the PRA, any person may file a civil action for injunctive or declaratory relief, or writ of mandate, to enforce their right to inspect or receive a copy of any public record or class of public records. Local agencies are “persons” under the PRA and may maintain an action to compel disclosure of records from another public entity. While the PRA clearly provides specific relief when a local agency denies access or copies of public records, it does not preclude a taxpayer lawsuit seeking declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the legality of a local agency’s policies or practices.

477 Gov. Code, §§ 54950 et. seq.
479 Long Beach Police Officers Association v. City of Long Beach (2014) 59 Cal.4th 59, 66 fn. 2; County of Santa Clara v. Superior Court (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 119, 128, 130 (taxpayer lawsuit may be brought to challenge legality of entity’s policies or practices for responding to public records requests generally).
for responding to public records requests generally. As a condition to obtaining an injunction, the party seeking injunctive relief may be required to post an undertaking in an amount determined by the court.

A local agency may not commence an action for declaratory relief to determine its obligation to disclose records under the PRA. The rationale for this rule is that allowing a local agency to seek declaratory relief to determine whether it must disclose records would require the person requesting documents to defend civil actions they did not commence and discourage them from requesting records. That would frustrate the purpose of furthering the fundamental right of every person in the state to have prompt access to information in the possession of local agencies. However, agencies may seek injunctive relief to preclude review and dissemination of, and to recover, inadvertently released exempt records, including attorney-client and work-product privileged records.

An action under the PRA may be filed in any court of competent jurisdiction, which typically is the superior court in the county where the records or some part of them are maintained.

**Timing**

The PRA does not contain a specific time period in which the action or responsive pleadings must be filed. Therefore, any action must be filed in a manner consistent with traditional actions for injunctive or declaratory relief, or writ of mandate, and is subject to any limitations periods or equitable concepts, such as laches, applicable to those actions. In a typical action under the PRA, the parties will file written arguments with the court to explain why the records should be disclosed or can be withheld. The court will also hold a hearing to give the parties an opportunity to argue the case. The judge in each case will establish the deadlines for briefing the issues and for hearings with the object of securing a decision at the earliest possible time.

**Discovery**

The PRA is considered a “special proceeding of a civil nature[,]” and as such, the Civil Discovery Act applies to actions brought under the PRA. Any discovery sought must still, however, be relevant to the subject matter of the pending action and the trial court has the discretion to restrict discovery to that which is likely to aid in the resolution of the particular issues presented in the proceeding.

A local agency that receives a request for records that would traditionally be sought through a formal discovery mechanism must handle the request in a manner consistent with the PRA rather than pursuant to discovery statutes. However, under the California Environmental Quality Act, a litigant may not use the PRA to avoid the statutory duty to pay for preparation of the administrative record.
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483 Code Civ. Proc. §529(a). See Stevenson v. City of Sacramento (2020) 55 Cal.App.5th 545 (Public Records Act litigants seeking an injunction are not exempt from requirement to post undertaking and that requirement is not an unlawful prior restraint under the First Amendment).
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487 Gov. Code, § 7923.100 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (a)).
**Burden of Proof**
In general, a plaintiff bears the burden of proving the plaintiff made a request for reasonably identifiable public records to a local agency and the agency improperly withheld or failed to conduct a reasonable search for the requested records.\(^{492}\) A local agency may assert, as affirmative defenses, and bears the burden of proving that: (i) a request was unclear and the agency provided adequate assistance to the requestor to identify records but was still unable to identify any records; (ii) the withholding was justified under the PRA;\(^ {493}\) or (iii) the local agency undertook a reasonable search for records but was unable to locate the requested records.\(^ {494}\)

**In Camera Review**
The judge must decide the case based on an in camera review of the record or records — that is, in the judge’s chambers and out of the presence and hearing of others — (if such review is permitted by the rules of evidence),\(^ {495}\) the papers filed by the parties, any oral argument, and additional evidence as the court may allow.\(^ {496}\) However, a judge cannot compel in camera disclosure of records claimed to be protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege for the purpose of determining whether the privilege applies.\(^ {497}\)

**Decision and Order**
If the court determines, based upon a verified petition, that certain public records are being improperly withheld, the court will order the officer or person withholding the records to disclose the public record or show cause why he or she should not do so.\(^ {498}\) If the court determines the local agency representative was justified in refusing to disclose the record, the court shall return the record to the local agency representative without disclosing its content, together with an order supporting the decision refusing disclosure.\(^ {499}\) The court may also order some of the records to be disclosed while upholding the decision to withhold other records. In addition, the court may order portions of the records be redacted and compel disclosure of the remaining portions.

**Reverse PRA Litigation**
While there is no specific statutory authority for such an action, a person who believes their rights would be infringed by a local agency decision to disclose documents may bring a “reverse PRA action” to seek an order enjoining disclosure.\(^ {500}\) A records requester may join in a reverse PRA action as a real party or an intervener.\(^ {501}\)

---

\(^{492}\) *Fredericks v. Superior Court* (2015) 233 Cal. App. 4th 209, 227 [“A person who seeks public records must present a reasonably focused and specific request, so that the public agency will have an opportunity to promptly identify and locate such records and to determine whether any exemption to disclosure applies”], disapproved on other grounds at *Nat'l Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 488, 508 fn. 9 (disapproving Fredericks to the extent it suggested an agency can recover redaction costs); *American Civil Liberties Union of N. Cal. v. Superior Court* (2011) 202 Cal. App. 4th 55, 85 [“Government agencies are, of course, entitled to a presumption that they have reasonably and in good faith complied with the obligation to disclose responsive information.”]


\(^{495}\) Evid. Code, § 915.

\(^{496}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.105 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (a)).

\(^{497}\) *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Superior Court* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 725, 737.

\(^{498}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.100 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (a)).

\(^{499}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.110 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (b)).


\(^{501}\) Id. at p. 1269.
PRACTICE TIP:
A local agency that receives a request for records that are or could be statutorily exempt from disclosure (under the PRA or otherwise) might consider notifying affected parties prior to disclosing the records. For example, “affected parties” would be individuals or organizations for whom disclosure could constitute an unwarranted intrusion of privacy if the requested documents contain potentially confidential information, such as trade secrets or confidential information of employees, contractors, or other third-party stakeholders. The notification prior to disclosing the records would allow the third parties to file a reverse PRA action to enjoin the local agency from disclosing the records.

A party bringing a reverse PRA action to prevent disclosure may be subject to paying the requestor’s attorney fees under the private attorney general statute if the requestor prevails. An agency, however, is not subject to paying the requestor’s attorney fees in a reverse PRA action.

Appellate Review
Petition for Review
The PRA establishes an expedited judicial review process. A trial court’s order is not considered to be a final judgment subject to the traditional and often lengthy appeal process. In place of a traditional appeal, such orders are subject to immediate review through the filing of a petition to the appellate court for the issuance of an extraordinary writ.

Because the trial court’s decision is not a final judgment for which there is an absolute right of appeal, the appellate court may decline to review the case without a hearing or without issuance of a detailed written opinion. However, the intent of substituting writ review for the traditional appeal process is to provide for expedited appellate review, not an abbreviated review. Therefore, an appellate court may not deny an apparently meritorious writ petition that has been timely presented and is procedurally sufficient merely because the petition presents no important issue of law or because it considers the case less worthy of its attention. This manner of providing for appellate review through an extraordinary writ procedure rather than a traditional appeal has been held to be constitutional.

Timing
A party seeking review of a trial court’s order must file a petition for review with the appellate court within 20 days after being served with a written notice of entry of the order, or within such further time, not exceeding an additional 20 days, as the trial court may for good cause allow. If the written notice of entry of the order is served by mail, the period within which to file the petition is increased by five days.

504 Gov. Code, § 7923.500, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (c)). But see Mincal Consumer Law Group v. Carlsbad Police Department (2013) 214 Cal.App.4th 259, 265 (under limited circumstances, an appellate court may exercise its discretion to treat an appeal from a non-appealable order as a petition for writ relief).
507 Id. at p. 115.
508 Gov. Code, § 7923.500, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (c)).
509 Gov. Code, § 7923.500, subd. (c) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (c)).
Once a court of appeal accepts a petition for review, the appellate process proceeds in much the same fashion as a traditional appeal. Unless the parties stipulate otherwise, the appellate court will establish a briefing schedule and may set the matter for oral arguments once briefing is complete.

**Requesting a Stay**

If a party wishes to prevent the disclosure of records pending appellate review of the trial court’s decision, then that party must seek a stay of the trial court’s order or judgment.\(^{510}\) In cases when the trial court’s order requires disclosure of records prior to the time when a petition for review must be filed, the party seeking a stay may apply to the trial court for a stay of the order or judgment. Where there is sufficient time for a party to file a petition for review prior to the date for disclosure, that party may seek a stay from the appellate court. The trial and appellate courts may only grant a stay when the party seeking the stay demonstrates that: (1) the party will sustain irreparable damage because of the disclosure; and (2) it is probable the party will succeed on the merits of the case on appeal.\(^{511}\)

**Scope and Standard of Review**

On appeal, the appellate court will conduct an independent review of the trial court’s ruling, upholding the factual findings made by the trial court if they are based on substantial evidence.\(^{512}\)

The decision of the appellate court, whether to deny review or on the merits of the case, is subject to discretionary review by the California Supreme Court through a petition for review.

**Appeal of Other Decisions under the PRA**

While the trial court’s decision regarding disclosure of records is not subject to the traditional appeal process, other decisions of the trial court related to a lawsuit under the PRA are subject to appeal. Thus, a trial court’s decision to grant or deny a motion for attorneys’ fees and costs under the PRA is subject to appeal and is not subject to the extraordinary writ process.\(^{513}\) Similarly, an award of sanctions in a public records case is subject to appeal rather than a petition for an extraordinary writ.\(^{514}\)

**Attorneys’ Fees and Costs**

Attorneys’ fees may be awarded to a prevailing party in an action under the PRA. If the plaintiff prevails in the litigation, the judge must award court costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees to the plaintiff.\(^{515}\) A member of the public may be entitled to an award of attorneys’ fees and costs even when he or she is not the named “plaintiff” in a lawsuit under the PRA, if the party is the functional equivalent of a plaintiff.\(^{516}\) Records requesters that participate in a reverse-PRA lawsuit are not entitled to an award of attorneys’ fees for successfully opposing such litigation.\(^{517}\) Successful local agency defendants may obtain an award of attorneys’ fees and court costs against an unsuccessful plaintiff only when the court finds the plaintiff’s case was clearly frivolous.\(^{518}\) Unless a plaintiff’s case is “utterly devoid of merit or taken for

---

\(^{510}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.500, subd. (d) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (c)).

\(^{511}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.500, subd. (d) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (c)).

\(^{512}\) Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1325, 1336.


\(^{518}\) Gov. Code, § 7923.115, subd. (b) (formerly Gov. Code, §6259, subd. (d)).
improper motive,” a court is unlikely to find a plaintiff’s case frivolous and award attorneys’ fees to an agency. Only one reported case has upheld an award of attorneys’ fees to a local agency based on a frivolous request.

Eligibility to Recover Attorneys’ Fees
In determining whether a plaintiff has prevailed, courts have applied several variations of analysis similar to that used under the private attorney general laws, i.e., whether the party has succeeded on any issue in the litigation and achieved some of the public benefits sought in the lawsuit. Some courts, however, have determined a plaintiff may still be a prevailing party entitled to attorneys’ fees under the PRA even without a favorable ruling or other court action. Trial courts have discretion to deny fees when a plaintiff obtains a result so minimal or insignificant as to justify a finding that the plaintiff did not prevail, which may occur when the requester obtains only partial relief.

Generally, if a local agency makes a timely, diligent effort to respond to a vague document request, a plaintiff will not be awarded attorneys’ fees as the prevailing party, even in litigation resulting in issuance of a writ. However, where the court determines a local agency was not sufficiently diligent in locating all requested records and issues declaratory relief, stating there has in fact been a violation of the PRA, even if the records sought no longer exist and cannot be produced, the court may still award attorneys’ fees on the basis of the statutory policies underlying the PRA.

The trial court has significant discretion when determining the appropriate amount of attorneys’ fees to award. Any award of costs and fees must be paid by the agency, and must not become a personal liability of the agency employees or officials who decide not to disclose requested records.

520 Butt v. City of Richmond, supra, 44 Cal.App.4th at p. 932.
526 Gov. Code, § 7923.115, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6259, subd. (d)).
Chapter 6

Records Management

In addition to the PRA, other California laws support and complement California’s commitment to open government and the right of access to public records. These laws include, among others, open meeting laws under the Ralph M. Brown Act, records retention requirements, and California and federal laws prohibiting the spoliation of public records that might be relevant in litigation involving the local agency. Proper records management policies and practices facilitate efficient and effective compliance with these laws.

Public Meeting Records

Under the Brown Act, any person may request a copy of a local agency meeting agenda and agenda packet by mail. If a local agency has an Internet website, the legislative body or its designee must email a copy of, or a website link to, the agenda or agenda packet if a person requests delivery by email. If requested, the agenda materials must be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities. If a local agency receives a written request to send agenda materials by mail, the materials must be mailed when the agenda is either posted or distributed to a majority of the agency’s legislative body, whichever occurs first. Requests for mailed copies of agenda materials are valid for the calendar year in which they are filed, but must be renewed after January 1 of each subsequent year. Local agency legislative bodies may establish a fee for mailing agenda materials. The fee may not exceed the cost of providing the service. Failure of a requester to receive agenda materials is not a basis for invalidating actions taken at the meeting for which agenda materials were not received.

528 Gov. Code, § 54954.1.
529 Ibid.
530 Ibid.
532 Gov. Code, § 54954.1.
533 Ibid.
534 Ibid.
535 Ibid.
Writings that are distributed to all or a majority of all members of a legislative body in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at a public meeting of the local agency are public records subject to disclosure, unless specifically exempted by the PRA, and must be made available upon request without delay.\textsuperscript{536} When non-exempt writings are distributed during a public meeting, in addition to making them available for public inspection at the meeting (if prepared by the local agency or a member of its legislative body) or after the meeting (if prepared by another person), they must be made available in appropriate alternative formats upon request by a person with a disability.\textsuperscript{537} The local agency may charge a fee for a copy of the records; however, no surcharge may be imposed on persons with disabilities.\textsuperscript{538} When records relating to agenda items are distributed to a majority of all members of a legislative body less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, the records must be made available for public inspection in a designated location at the same time they are distributed.\textsuperscript{539} The address of the designated location shall be listed in the meeting agenda.\textsuperscript{540} The local agency may also post the information on its website in a place and manner which makes it clear the records relate to an agenda item for an upcoming meeting.\textsuperscript{541}

**Maintaining Electronic Records**

“Public records,” as defined by the PRA, includes “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.”\textsuperscript{542} The PRA does not require a local agency to keep records in an electronic format. But, if a local agency has an existing, non-exempt public record in an electronic format, the PRA does require the agency make those records available in any electronic format in which it holds the records when requested.\textsuperscript{543} The PRA also requires the local agency to provide a copy of such records in any alternative electronic format requested, if the alternative format is one the agency uses for itself or for provision to other agencies.\textsuperscript{544} The PRA does not require a local agency to release a public record in the electronic form in which it is held if the release would jeopardize or compromise the security or integrity of the original record or of any proprietary software in which it is maintained.\textsuperscript{545} Likewise, the PRA does not permit public access to records held electronically, if access is otherwise restricted by statute.\textsuperscript{546}

\textsuperscript{536} Gov. Code, § 54957.5, subd. (a).
\textsuperscript{537} Gov. Code, § 54957.5, subd. (c).
\textsuperscript{538} Gov. Code, § 54957.5, subd. (d). See Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{539} Gov. Code, § 54957.5, subds. (b)(1), (b)(2).
\textsuperscript{540} Gov. Code, § 54957.5, subd. (b)(2).
\textsuperscript{541} Gov. Code, § 54957.5, subd. (b)(2).
\textsuperscript{542} Gov. Code, § 7920.330 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6252, subd. (e)).
\textsuperscript{543} Gov. Code, § 7922.570, subd. (b)(1) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.9, subd. (a)(1)).
\textsuperscript{544} Gov. Code, § 7922.570, subd. (b)(2) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.9, subd. (a)(2)).
\textsuperscript{545} Gov. Code, § 7922.580, subd. (c) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.9, subd. (f)).
\textsuperscript{546} Gov. Code, § 7922.580, subd. (d) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.9, subd. (g)).
**PRACTICE TIP:**

Local agencies should consider adopting electronic records policies governing such issues as: what electronic records (e.g., emails, texts, and social media) and what attributes of the electronically stored information and communications are considered “retained in the ordinary course of business” for purposes of the PRA; whether personal electronic devices (such as computers, tablets, cell phones) and personal email accounts may be used to store or send electronic communications concerning the local agency, or whether the agency’s devices must be used; and privacy expectations. Local agencies should consult with information technology officials to understand what information is being stored electronically and the technological limits of their systems for the retention and production of electronic records.

Duplication costs of electronic records are limited to the direct cost of producing the electronic copy. However, requesters may be required to bear additional costs of producing a copy of an electronic record, such as programming and computer services costs, if the request requires the production of electronic records that are otherwise only produced at regularly scheduled intervals, or production of the record would require data compilation, extraction, or programming. Agencies are not required to reconstruct electronic copies of records no longer available to the agency in electronic format.

**Metadata**

Electronic records may include “metadata,” or data about data contained in a record that is not visible in the text. For example, metadata may describe how, when, or by whom particular data was collected, and contain information about document authors, other documents, or commentary or notes. Although no provision of the PRA expressly addresses metadata, and there are no reported court opinions in California considering whether or to what extent metadata is subject to disclosure, other jurisdictions have held that metadata is a public record subject to disclosure, unless an exemption applies. There are no reported California court opinions providing guidance on whether agencies have a duty to disclose metadata when an electronic record contains exempt information that cannot be reasonably segregated without compromising the record’s integrity.

**Computer Software**

The PRA permits government agencies to develop and commercialize computer software and to benefit from copyright protections for agency-developed software. Computer software developed by state or local agencies, including computer mapping systems, computer programs, and computer graphics systems, is not a public record subject to disclosure. As a result, public agencies are not required to provide copies of agency-developed software pursuant to the PRA. The PRA authorizes state and local agencies to sell, lease, or license agency-developed software for

---

547 Gov. Code, § 7922.575, subd. (a) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.9, subd. (a)(2)).
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551 Gov. Code, § 7922.585, subds. (a), (b) (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.9,subds. (a), (b)).
commercial or noncommercial use. The exception for agency-developed software does not affect the exempt status of records merely because it is stored electronically.

**Computer Mapping (GIS) Systems**

While computer mapping systems developed by local agencies are not public records subject to disclosure, such systems generally include geographic information system (GIS) data. Many local agencies use GIS programs and databases for a broad range of purposes, including the creation and editing of maps depicting property and facilities of importance to the local agency and the public. As with metadata, the PRA does not expressly address GIS information disclosure. However, the California Supreme Court has held, that while GIS software is exempt under the PRA, the data in a GIS file format is a public record, and data in a GIS database must be produced.

**Public Contracting Records**

State and local agencies subject to the Public Contract Code that receive bids for construction of a public work or improvement, must, upon request from a contractor plan room service, provide an electronic copy of a project’s contract documents at no charge to the contractor plan room. The Public Contract Code does not define the term “contractor plan room,” but the term commonly refers to a clearinghouse that contractors can use to identify potential bidding opportunities and obtain bid documents. The term may also refer to an online resource for a contractor to share plans and information with subcontractors.

**Electronic Discovery**

The importance of maintaining a written document retention policy is evident by revisions to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and California’s Civil Discovery Act and procedures, relative to electronic discovery. Those provisions and discovery procedures require parties in litigation to address the production and preservation of electronic records. Those rule changes may require a local agency to alter its routine management or storage of electronic information, and illustrate the importance of having and following formal document retention policies.

Once a local agency knows or receives notice that information is relevant to litigation (e.g., a litigation hold notice or a document preservation notice), it has a duty to preserve that information for discovery. In some cases, the local agency may have to suspend the routine operation of its information systems (through a litigation hold) to preserve information relevant to the litigation and avoid the potential imposition of sanctions.

---
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Record Retention and Destruction Laws

The PRA is not a records retention statute. The PRA does not prescribe what type of information a public agency may gather or keep, or provide a method for correcting records. Its sole function is to provide access to public records. Other provisions of state law govern retention of public records.

Local agencies generally must retain public records for a minimum of two years. However, some records may be destroyed sooner. For example, duplicate records that are less than two years old may be destroyed if no longer required. Similarly, the retention period for “recordings of telephone and radio communications” is 100 days and “routine video monitoring” need only be retained for one year, and may be destroyed or erased after 90 days if another record, such as written minutes, is kept of the recorded event. “Routine video monitoring” is defined as “video recording by a video or electronic imaging system designed to record the regular and ongoing operations of a [local agency] ..., including mobile in-car video systems, jail observation and monitoring systems, and building security recording systems.” The Attorney General has opined that recordings by security cameras on public buses and other transit vehicles constitute “routine video monitoring.” Whether additional recording technology used for law and parking enforcement such as body cameras and Vehicle License Plate Recognition (“VLPR”) systems also constitute routine video monitoring is an open question and may depend upon its use. While the technology is very similar to in-car video systems, recordings targeting specific activity may not be “routine.” The retention statutes do not provide a specific retention period for e-mails, texts, or forms of social media.

By contrast, state law does not permit destruction of records affecting title to or liens on real property, court records, records required to be kept by statute, and the minutes, ordinances, or resolutions of the legislative body or city board or commission. In addition, employers are required to maintain personnel records for at least three years after an employee’s termination, subject to certain exceptions, including peace officer personnel records, pre-employment records, and where an applicable collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise. Complaints and any reports or findings relating to those complaints must be retained for no less than five years for records where there was not a sustained finding of misconduct and for not less than 15 years where there was a sustained finding of misconduct.

To ensure compliance with these laws, most local agencies adopt records retention schedules as a key element of a records management system.

558 Ibid.
559 For example, an agency cannot destroy records that qualify for inclusion in an administrative record in a writ proceeding. Golden Door Properties, LLC v. Superior Court (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 733.
560 Gov. Code, § 34090, subd. (d).
561 Gov. Code, § 34090.7.
563 Gov. Code, §§ 34090.6, 34090.7.
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Records Covered by the Records Retention Laws

There is no definition of “public records” or “records” in the records retention provisions governing local agencies.\(^{568}\) The Attorney General has opined that the definition of “public records” for purposes of the records retention statutes is “a thing which constitutes an objective lasting indication of a writing, event or other information, which is in the custody of a public officer and is kept either (1) because a law requires it to be kept; or (2) because it is necessary or convenient to the discharge of the public officer’s duties and was made or retained for the purpose of preserving its informational content for future reference.”\(^{569}\) Under that definition, local agency officials retain some discretion concerning what agency records must be kept pursuant to state records retention laws. Similarly, the PRA allows for local agency discretion concerning what preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda are retained in the ordinary course of business.\(^{570}\)

---

**PRACTICE TIP:**

Though there is no definition of “records” for purposes of the retention requirements applicable to local agencies, the retention requirements and the disclosure requirements of the PRA should complement each other. Local agencies should exercise caution in deviating too far from the definition of “public records” in the PRA in interpreting what records should be retained under the records retention statutes.

---

569 Id. at p. 324.
Frequently Requested Information and Records

This table is intended as a general guide on the applicable law and is not intended to provide legal advice. The facts and circumstances of each request should be carefully considered in light of the applicable law. A local agency’s legal counsel should always be consulted when legal issues arise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED</th>
<th>MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED?</th>
<th>APPLICABLE AUTHORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENDA MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED TO A LEGISLATIVE BODY RELATING TO AN OPEN SESSION ITEM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 54957.5. For additional information, see p. 71 of “The People’s Business: A Guide to the California Public Records Act,” “the Guide.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDITOR RECORDS</td>
<td>Yes, with certain exceptions</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 36525(b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMATED TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM (RED LIGHT CAMERA) RECORDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Veh. Code, § 21455.5(f)(1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALENDARS OF ELECTED OFFICIALS</td>
<td>Perhaps not, but note that there is no published appellate court decision on this issue post- Prop. 59.¹</td>
<td>See Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 53 Cal.3d. 1325 and Rogers v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 469 for a discussion of the deliberative process privilege. For additional information, see p. 34 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG LICENSE INFORMATION</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>See conflict between Health &amp; Safety Code, § 121690(h) which states that license information is confidential, and Food and Agr. Code, § 30803(b) stating license tag applications shall remain open for public inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTION PETITIONS (INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM AND RECALL PETITIONS)</td>
<td>No, except to proponents if petition found to be insufficient</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7924.100-7924.110 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6253.5); Elec. Code, §§ 17200, 17400, and 18650; Evid. Code, § 1050. For additional information, see p. 37 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAILS AND TEXT MESSAGES OF LOCAL AGENCY STAFF AND/OR OFFICIALS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Emails and text messages relating to local agency business on local agency and/or personal accounts and devices are public records. Gov. Code, § 7920.530 (formerly Gov. Code § 6252(e)); City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017) 2 Cal. 5th 608. For additional information, see pp. 12-14 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT REPORT FORMS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 53232.3(e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM 700 (STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS) AND CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS</td>
<td>Yes²</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 81008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Prop. 59 was enacted in 2016 and affects the disclosure of information related to personal finances. |
² Form 700 is not subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act, but is subject to other state and federal laws.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED</th>
<th>MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED?</th>
<th>APPLICABLE AUTHORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADING DOCUMENTS INCLUDING GEOLOGY REPORTS, COMPACTION REPORTS, AND SOILS REPORTS SUBMITTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH AN APPLICATION FOR A BUILDING PERMIT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 39 (2006); but see Gov. Code, § 7927.300 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(e)). For additional information, see p. 30 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUVENILE COURT RECORDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>T.N.G. v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d. 767; Welf. &amp; Inst. Code, §§ 827 and 828. For additional information, see p. 44 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL BILLING STATEMENTS</td>
<td>Generally, yes, as to amount billed and/or after litigation has ended.</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(k)); Evid. Code, § 950, et seq.; County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors v. Superior Court (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 282; Smith v. Laguna Sun Villas Community Assoc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 639; United States v. Amlani, 169 F.3d 1189 (9th Cir. 1999). But see Gov. Code, § 7927.200 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(b)) as to the disclosure of billing amounts reflecting legal strategy in pending litigation. County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court (2012) 211 Cal. App. 4th 57 (Pending litigation exemption does not protect legal bills reflecting the hours worked, the identity of the person performing the work, and the amount charged from disclosure; only work product or privileged descriptions of work may be redacted). For additional information, see p. 33 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY PATRON USE RECORDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, §§ 7927.100, 7927.105 (formerly Gov. Code, §§ 6254(j), 6267). For additional information, see p. 44 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL RECORDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7927.700 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(c)). For additional information, see p. 46 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTAL HEALTH DETENTIONS (5150 REPORTS)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Welf. &amp; Inst. Code, § 5328. For additional information, see p. 44 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTICES/ORDERS TO PROPERTY OWNER RE: HOUSING/BUILDING CODE VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7924.700 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.7(c)). For additional information, see p. 1 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICIAL BUILDING PLANS (ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS AND PLANS)</td>
<td>Inspection only. Copies provided under certain circumstances.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Saf. Code, § 19851; see also 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 102. For additional information, see p. 30 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL FINANCIAL RECORDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, §§ 7470, 7471, 7473; see also Gov. Code, § 7925.005 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(n)). For additional information, see p. 46 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>For additional information, see p. 52 of the Guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee inspection of own personnel file</td>
<td>Yes, with exceptions.</td>
<td>For additional information, see pp. 29-31 of the Guide. Lab. Code, § 1198.5; Gov. Code, § 36501.5. For peace officers, see Gov. Code, § 3306.5. For firefighters, see Gov. Code, § 3256.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED</td>
<td>MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED?</td>
<td>APPLICABLE AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Name and pension amounts of public agency retirees</td>
<td>Yes. However, personal or individual records, including medical information, remain exempt from disclosure.</td>
<td>Sacramento County Employees Retirement System v. Superior Court (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 440; San Diego County Employees Retirement Association v. Superior Court (2011) 196 Cal.App.4th 1228; Sonoma County Employees Retirement Assn. v. Superior Court (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Names and salaries (including performance bonuses and overtime) of public employees, including peace officers</td>
<td>Yes, absent unique, individual circumstances. However, other personal information such as social security numbers, home telephone numbers and home addresses are generally exempt from disclosure per Gov. Code, § 6254(c).</td>
<td>International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO, et al. v. Superior Court (2007) 42 Cal.4th 278; Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training v. Superior Court (2007) 42 Cal.4th 319.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Officer's personnel file, including internal affairs investigation reports</td>
<td>No, except for specified allegations and/or findings.</td>
<td>With certain exceptions, peace officer personnel records, including internal affairs reports regarding alleged misconduct, are confidential. Pen. Code, §§ 832.7 and 832.8; Evid. Code, §§ 1043-1045; International Federation of Professional &amp; Technical Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court (2007) 42 Cal.4th 319; City of Hemet v. Superior Court (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 1411. For additional information, see p. 53 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Test Questions, scoring keys, and other examination data.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7929.605 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(g)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICE/LAW ENFORCEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED</th>
<th>MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED?</th>
<th>APPLICABLE AUTHORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Child abuse reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pen. Code, §11167.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen complaint policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pen. Code, § 832.5(a)(1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen complaints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pen. Code, § 832.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen complaints – annual summary report to the Attorney General</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pen. Code, § 832.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen complainant information – names addresses and telephone numbers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>City of San Jose v. San Jose Mercury News (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 1008. For additional information see p. 42 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED</td>
<td>MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED?</td>
<td>APPLICABLE AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concealed weapon permits and applications</td>
<td>Yes, except for information that indicates when or where the applicant is vulnerable to attack and medical/psychological history</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7923.800 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(u)(1)); CBS, Inc. v. Block (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact information – names, addresses and phone numbers of crime victims or witnesses</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7923.615 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(f)(2)). For additional information, see p. 42 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crime reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gov. Code, §§ 7923.600-7923.625, 7922.000 (formerly 6254(f), 6255).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crime reports, including witness statements</td>
<td>Yes, but only to crime victims and their representatives</td>
<td>Gov. Code, §§ 7923.600-7923.625 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(f)). Gov. Code, § 13951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Law Enforcement, CONTINUED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elder abuse reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Welf. and Inst. Code, §15633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In custody death reports to AG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 12525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Juvenile court records</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>T.N.G. v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal.3d 767; Welf. &amp; Inst. Code, §§ 827 and 828. For additional information, see p. 44 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mental health detention(5150) reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Welf. &amp; Inst. Code, § 5328. For additional information, see p. 44 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Official service photographs of peace officers</td>
<td>Yes, unless disclosure would pose an unreasonable risk of harm to the officer</td>
<td>Ibarra v. Superior Court (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 695.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peace officer’s name, employing agency and employment dates</td>
<td>Yes, absent unique, individual circumstances</td>
<td>Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training v. Superior Court (2007) 42 Cal.4th 278.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic accident reports</td>
<td>Yes, but only to certain parties</td>
<td>Veh. Code, §§ 16005, 20012 [only disclose to those needing the information, such as insurance companies, and the individuals involved].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED</td>
<td>MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED?</td>
<td>APPLICABLE AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bid Proposals, RFP proposals</td>
<td>Yes, except competitive proposals may be withheld until negotiations are complete to avoid prejudicing the public</td>
<td>Michaelis v. Superior Court (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 1065; but see Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255) and Evid. Code, § 1060. For additional information, see p. 59 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Certified payroll records</td>
<td>Yes, but records must be redacted to protect employee names, addresses, and social security number from disclosure</td>
<td>Labor Code, § 1776.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial information submitted for bids</td>
<td>Yes, except some corporate financial information may be protected</td>
<td>Gov. Code, §§ 7927.500, 7928.705, 7927.705, 7927.605, and 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, §§ 6254(a), (h), and (k), 6254.15, and 6255); Schnabel v. Superior Court of Orange County (1993) 5 Cal.4th 704, 718. For additional information, see p. 60 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trade secrets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Evid. Code, § 1060; Civ. Code, § 3426, et seq. For additional information, see p. 61 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PURCHASE PRICE OF REAL PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td>Yes, after the agency acquires the property</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7275.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REAL ESTATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>For additional information, see p. 60 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property information (such as selling assessed value, square footage, number of rooms)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 153 (2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appraisals and offers to purchase</td>
<td>Yes, but only after conclusion of the property acquisition</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7928.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(h)). Note that Gov. Code, § 7267.2 requires release of more information to the property owner while the acquisition is pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORT OF ARREST NOT RESULTING IN CONVICTION</strong></td>
<td>No, except as to peace officers or peace officer applicants</td>
<td>Lab. Code, § 432.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Register Division of Freedom Newspapers v. County of Orange (1984) 158 Cal.App.3d 893. For additional information, see p. 49 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAKER CARDS</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAX RETURN INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7927.705 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(k)); Internal Revenue Code, § 6103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXPAYER INFORMATION RECEIVED IN CONNECTION WITH COLLECTION OF LOCAL TAXES</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7925.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254(i)). For additional information, see p. 61 of the Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER TEST SCORES, IDENTIFIED BY NAME, SHOWING TEACHERS’ EFFECT ON STUDENTS’ STANDARDIZED TEST PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gov. Code, § 7922.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6255); Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 222.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INFORMATION/RECORDS REQUESTED | MUST THE INFORMATION/RECORD GENERALLY BE DISCLOSED? | APPLICABLE AUTHORITY
--- | --- | ---
**TELEPHONE RECORDS OF ELECTED OFFICIALS** | Yes, as to expense totals. No, as to phone numbers called. | See Rogers v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 469. 
**VOTER INFORMATION** | No | Gov. Code, § 7924.000 (formerly Gov. Code, § 6254.4). For additional information, see p. 36 of the Guide. 
**VOTER INFORMATION** | No | Gov. Code, § 6254.4. For additional information, see p. 36 of the Guide. 

1 The analysis with respect to elected officials may not necessarily apply to executive officers such as City Managers or Chief Administrative Officers, and there is no case law directly addressing this issue.

2 It should be noted that these statements must be made available for inspection and copying not later than the second business day following the day on which the request was received.
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## APPENDIX 2: CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION’S DISPOSITION TABLE

### DISPOSITION OF FORMER LAW

---

**Note.** This table shows the proposed disposition of the following provisions of the California Public Records Act (Gov’t Code §§ 6250- 6276.48), as that law will exist on January 1, 2020. Unless otherwise indicated, all statutory references are to the Government Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6250-6276.48</td>
<td>7920.000-7930.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250</td>
<td>7921.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6251-6276.48</td>
<td>7920.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(a)</td>
<td>7920.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(b)</td>
<td>7920.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(c)</td>
<td>7920.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(d)</td>
<td>7920.525(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(e)</td>
<td>7920.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(f)</td>
<td>7920.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252(g)</td>
<td>7920.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252.5</td>
<td>7921.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252.6</td>
<td>7927.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252.7</td>
<td>7921.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(a)</td>
<td>7922.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(a) 1st sent</td>
<td>7922.525(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(a) 2d sent</td>
<td>7922.525(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(b)</td>
<td>7922.530(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(c)</td>
<td>7922.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(c) 1st, 4th sent</td>
<td>7922.535(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(c) 2d, 3d sent</td>
<td>7922.535(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(c) 5th sent</td>
<td>7922.535(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(d) 1st sent</td>
<td>7922.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(d)(1)</td>
<td>7922.530(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(d)(2)</td>
<td>7922.530(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(d)(3)</td>
<td>7922.540(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(e)</td>
<td>7922.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(f) 1st sent</td>
<td>7922.545(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253(f) 2d sent</td>
<td>7922.545(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.1(a)-(c)</td>
<td>7922.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.1(d)</td>
<td>7922.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.2</td>
<td>7926.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.21</td>
<td>7927.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.3</td>
<td>7921.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.31</td>
<td>7928.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.4(a) 1st ¶</td>
<td>7922.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.4(a) 2d ¶</td>
<td>7922.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.4(b)</td>
<td>7922.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.5</td>
<td>7924.100-7924.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.5(a) 1st sent</td>
<td>7924.110(a)-(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.5(a) 2d sent</td>
<td>7924.110(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.5(b)</td>
<td>7924.110(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.5(c)</td>
<td>7924.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.5(d)</td>
<td>7924.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.6</td>
<td>7924.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.8(a)-(e)</td>
<td>7924.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.8(f)</td>
<td>not cont’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9 intro cl 1st part</td>
<td>7922.570-7922.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9 intro cl 2d part</td>
<td>7922.570(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(a)(1)</td>
<td>7922.570(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(a)(2) 1st sent</td>
<td>7922.570(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(a)(2) 2d sent</td>
<td>7922.575(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(b)</td>
<td>7922.575(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(c)</td>
<td>7922.580(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(d)</td>
<td>7922.570(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(e)</td>
<td>7922.580(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(f)</td>
<td>7922.580(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.9(g)</td>
<td>7922.580(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253.10</td>
<td>7922.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(a)</td>
<td>7927.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(b)</td>
<td>7927.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(c)</td>
<td>7927.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(d)</td>
<td>7929.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(e)</td>
<td>7927.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)</td>
<td>7923.600-7923.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(1) 1st sent</td>
<td>7923.600(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(1) 2d sent</td>
<td>7923.605(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(1) 3d sent</td>
<td>7923.605(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(1) 2d ¶</td>
<td>7923.600(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(1) 3d ¶</td>
<td>7923.610, 7923.615(a), 7923.620(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(1)</td>
<td>7923.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(2)(A) 1st sent</td>
<td>7923.615(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(2)(A) 2d, 3d sent</td>
<td>7923.615(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(2)(A) 1st sent</td>
<td>7923.615(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(3) 1st, 2d sent</td>
<td>7923.620(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(3) 3d sent</td>
<td>7923.620(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(3) 4th sent</td>
<td>7923.620(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(f)(4)</td>
<td>7923.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(g)</td>
<td>7929.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(h)</td>
<td>7928.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(i)</td>
<td>7928.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(j)</td>
<td>7928.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(k)</td>
<td>7928.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(l)</td>
<td>7928.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(m)</td>
<td>7928.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(n)</td>
<td>7925.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(o)</td>
<td>7924.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(p)(1)</td>
<td>7928.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(p)(2)</td>
<td>7928.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(q)(1)</td>
<td>7926.220(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(q)(2)</td>
<td>7926.220(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(q)(3)</td>
<td>7926.220(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(q)(4)</td>
<td>7926.220(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(r)</td>
<td>7927.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(s)</td>
<td>7926.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(t)</td>
<td>7926.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(u)(1)</td>
<td>7923.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(u)(2)-(3)</td>
<td>7923.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(v)(1)</td>
<td>7926.225(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(v)(2)</td>
<td>7926.225(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(v)(3)</td>
<td>7926.225(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(v)(4)</td>
<td>7926.225(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(w)</td>
<td>7926.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(w)(1)</td>
<td>7926.235(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(w)(2)</td>
<td>7926.235(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(w)(3)</td>
<td>7926.235(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(x)</td>
<td>7925.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(y)(1)</td>
<td>7926.230(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(y)(2)</td>
<td>7926.230(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(y)(3)</td>
<td>7926.230(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(y)(4)</td>
<td>7926.230(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(y)(5)</td>
<td>7926.230(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(2)</td>
<td>7923.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(aa)</td>
<td>7929.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ab)</td>
<td>7929.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ab) 1st sent</td>
<td>7929.205(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ab) 2d sent</td>
<td>7929.205(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ab) 3d sent</td>
<td>7929.205(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ac)</td>
<td>7926.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)</td>
<td>7929.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)(1)</td>
<td>7929.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)(2)</td>
<td>7929.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)(3)</td>
<td>7929.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)(4)</td>
<td>7929.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)(5)</td>
<td>7929.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(ad)(6)</td>
<td>7929.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254(last ¶ (unlabeled)</td>
<td>7921.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.1(a)</td>
<td>7927.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.1(b)</td>
<td>7927.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.1(c)</td>
<td>7929.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2</td>
<td>7924.300-7924.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(a)</td>
<td>7924.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(b)</td>
<td>7924.305(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(c)</td>
<td>7924.305(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(d)</td>
<td>7924.305(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(e)</td>
<td>7924.305(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(f)</td>
<td>7924.305(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(g)</td>
<td>7924.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(h)</td>
<td>7924.310(a)-(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(i)</td>
<td>7924.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(j)</td>
<td>7924.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(k)</td>
<td>7924.310(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(l)</td>
<td>7924.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(m)</td>
<td>7924.305(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.2(n)</td>
<td>7924.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.3</td>
<td>7928.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.4</td>
<td>7924.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.4.5</td>
<td>7923.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.5</td>
<td>7921.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.5 1st sent</td>
<td>7921.505(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.5 2d sent</td>
<td>7921.505(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.5(a)-(i)</td>
<td>7921.505(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.6</td>
<td>7927.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7 (except (c))</td>
<td>7924.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(a)</td>
<td>7924.510(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(b)</td>
<td>7924.510(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(c)</td>
<td>7924.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(d) 1st sent</td>
<td>7924.510(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(d) 2d sent</td>
<td>7924.510(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(e)</td>
<td>7924.510(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.7(f)</td>
<td>7924.510(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.8</td>
<td>7928.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.9</td>
<td>7922.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.10</td>
<td>7927.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.11</td>
<td>7924.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.12</td>
<td>7929.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.13</td>
<td>7929.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(a)</td>
<td>7926.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(a)(1)</td>
<td>7926.215(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(a)(2)</td>
<td>7926.215(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(a)(3)</td>
<td>7926.215(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(a)(4)</td>
<td>7926.215(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(a)(5)</td>
<td>7926.215(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.14(b)</td>
<td>7926.220(d), 7926.225(d), 7926.230(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.15</td>
<td>7927.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.16</td>
<td>7927.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.17</td>
<td>7923.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18</td>
<td>7926.400-7926.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(a)</td>
<td>7926.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(b)</td>
<td>7926.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(b)(1)</td>
<td>7926.400(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(b)(2)</td>
<td>7926.400(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(b)(3)</td>
<td>7926.400(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(b)(4)</td>
<td>7926.400(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(c)</td>
<td>7926.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(d)</td>
<td>7926.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(d) 1st sent</td>
<td>7926.415(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(d) 2d sent</td>
<td>7926.415(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(d) 3d sent</td>
<td>7926.415(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(e)</td>
<td>7926.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(f)</td>
<td>7926.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.18(g)</td>
<td>7926.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.19</td>
<td>7929.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.20</td>
<td>7927.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21 (except (f))</td>
<td>7928.200-7928.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(a)</td>
<td>7928.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(b)</td>
<td>7928.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(c)</td>
<td>7928.215-7928.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)</td>
<td>7928.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(A)</td>
<td>7928.215(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(B)</td>
<td>7928.215(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(C)</td>
<td>7928.215(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(D)</td>
<td>7928.215(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXISTING PROVISION(S) | PROPOSED PROVISION(S)
--- | ---
6254.21(c)(1)(E) | 7928.215(a)
6254.21(c)(2) | 7928.225
6254.21(c)(3) | 7928.220
6254.21(d) | 7928.230
6254.21(e) | 7928.200(b)
6254.21(f) | 7920.500
6254.21(g) | 7928.200(a)
6254.22 | 7926.205
6254.22 1st sent | 7926.205(a)
6254.22 2d sent | 7926.205(b)
6254.22 3d & 4th sent | 7926.205(c)
6254.23 | 7929.215
6254.24 | 7920.535
6254.25 | 7927.205
6254.26 | 7928.710
6254.26(a) | 7928.710(b)
6254.26(b) | 7928.710(c)
6254.26(c) | 7928.710(a)
6254.27 | 7922.205
6254.28 | 7922.210
6254.29 | 7922.200
6254.30 | 7923.655
6254.30 1st sent | 7923.655(a)
6254.30 2d sent | 7923.655(b)
6254.33 | 7928.715
6254.35 | 7929.010
6255(a) | 7922.000
6255(b) | 7922.540(a)
6257.5 | 7921.300
6258 1st sent | 7923.000
6258 2d sent | 7923.005
6259 (except (c) 1st sent intro cl) | 7923.100-7923.500
6259(a) 1st sent | 7923.100
6259(a) 2d sent | 7923.105
6259(b) | 7923.110
6259(c) 1st sent intro cl | not cont’d
6259(c) remainder | 7923.500
6259(d) | 7923.115(a)-(b)
6259(e) | 7923.115(c)
6260. | 7920.200
6261. | 7928.720
6262. | 7923.650
6263. | 7921.700
6264. | 7921.705
6265. | 7921.710
6267. | 7927.105
6268. | 7928.005, 7928.010
6268(a) | 7928.005
6268(b) | 7928.010(a)
6268(c) | 7928.010(b)
6268.5 | 7928.015
6270. | 7921.010
6270.5 | 7922.700-7922.725
**EXISTING PROVISION(S)** | **PROPOSED PROVISION(S)**
---|---
6270.5(a) 1st sent. | 7922.710(a)
6270.5(a) 2d sent | 7922.715(a)
6270.5(a) 3d sent | 7922.715(b)
6270.5(a) 4th sent | 7922.720(a), (b)
6270.5(b) | 7922.725(a)
6270.5(c)(1) | 7922.700(a)
6270.5(c)(2) | 7922.705
6270.5(c)(3) | 7922.700(b)
6270.5(d) | 7922.725(b)
6270.5(e) | 7922.720(c)
6270.5(f) | 7922.710(b)
6270.6 | 7928.800
6270.7 | 7926.500
6275-6276.48 | 7930.000-7930.215
6275 | 7930.000
6276 | 7930.005
6276.01 | 7930.100
6276.02 | 7930.105
6276.04 | 7930.110
6276.06 | 7930.115
6276.08 | 7930.120
6276.10 | 7930.125
6276.12 | 7930.130
6276.14 | 7930.135
6276.16 | 7930.140
6276.18 | 7930.145
6276.22 | 7930.150
6276.24 | 7930.155
6276.26 | 7930.160
6276.28 | 7930.165
6276.30 | 7930.170
6276.32 | 7930.175
6276.34 | 7930.180
6276.36 | 7930.185
6276.38 | 7930.190
6276.40 | 7930.195
6276.42 | 7930.200
6276.44 | 7930.205
6276.46 | 7930.210
6276.48 | 7930.215
### DERIVATION OF NEW LAW

**Note.** This table shows the derivation of each proposed provision in this recommendation. Unless otherwise indicated, all statutory references are to the Government Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7920.000</td>
<td>6251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.005</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.100</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.105</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.110</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.115</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.120</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.200</td>
<td>6260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.500</td>
<td>6254.21(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.505</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.510</td>
<td>6252(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.515</td>
<td>6252(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.520</td>
<td>6252(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.525(a)</td>
<td>6252(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.525(b)</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.530</td>
<td>6252(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.535</td>
<td>6254.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.540</td>
<td>6252(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7920.545</td>
<td>6252(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.000</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.005</td>
<td>6253.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.010</td>
<td>6270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.300</td>
<td>6257.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.305</td>
<td>6252.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.310</td>
<td>6252.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.500</td>
<td>6254 next-to-last ¶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.505</td>
<td>6254.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.505(a)</td>
<td>6254.5 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.505(b)</td>
<td>6254.5 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.505(c)</td>
<td>6254.5(a)-(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.700</td>
<td>6263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.705</td>
<td>6264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7921.710</td>
<td>6265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.000</td>
<td>6255(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.200</td>
<td>6254.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.205</td>
<td>6254.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.210</td>
<td>6254.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.500</td>
<td>6253(d) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.505</td>
<td>6253(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.525</td>
<td>6253(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.525(a)</td>
<td>6253(a) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.525(b)</td>
<td>6253(a) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.530(a)</td>
<td>6253(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.530(b)</td>
<td>6253(d)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.530(c)</td>
<td>6253(d)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.535</td>
<td>6253(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.535(a)</td>
<td>6253(c) 1st, 4th sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.535(b)</td>
<td>6253(c) 2d, 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.535(c)</td>
<td>6253(c) 5th sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.540(a)</td>
<td>6255(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.540(b)</td>
<td>6253(d)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.540(c)</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.545</td>
<td>6253(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.545(a)</td>
<td>6253(f) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.545(b)</td>
<td>6253(f) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.570-7922.580</td>
<td>6253.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.570(a)</td>
<td>6253.9 intro cl 1st part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.570(b)</td>
<td>6253.9 intro cl 2d part, (a)(1), (a)(2) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.570(c)</td>
<td>6253.9(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.575(a)</td>
<td>6253.9(a)(2) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.575(b)</td>
<td>6253.9(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.580(a)</td>
<td>6253.9(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.580(b)</td>
<td>6253.9(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.580(c)</td>
<td>6253.9(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.580(d)</td>
<td>6253.9(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.585</td>
<td>6254.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.600</td>
<td>6253.1(a)-(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.605</td>
<td>6253.1(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.630</td>
<td>6253.4(a) 1st ¶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.635</td>
<td>6253.4(a) 2d ¶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.640</td>
<td>6253.4(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.680</td>
<td>6253.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.700-7922.725</td>
<td>6270.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.700(a)</td>
<td>6270.5(c)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.700(b)</td>
<td>6270.5(c)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.705</td>
<td>6270.5(c)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.710(a)</td>
<td>6270.5(a) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.710(b)</td>
<td>6270.5(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.715(a)</td>
<td>6270.5(a) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.715(b)</td>
<td>6270.5(a) 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.720(a), (b)</td>
<td>6270.5(a) 4th sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.720(c)</td>
<td>6270.5(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.725(a)</td>
<td>6270.5(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7922.725(b)</td>
<td>6270.5(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.000</td>
<td>6258 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.005</td>
<td>6258 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.100-7923.500</td>
<td>6259 (except (c) 1st sent intro cl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.100</td>
<td>6259(a) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.105</td>
<td>6259(a) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.110</td>
<td>6259(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.115(a)-(b)</td>
<td>6259(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.115(c)</td>
<td>6259(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.500</td>
<td>6259(c) (except obsolete intro cl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.600-7923.625</td>
<td>6254(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.600(a)</td>
<td>6254(f) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.600(b)</td>
<td>6254(f) 2d ¶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.605(a)</td>
<td>6254(f) 2d ¶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.605(b)</td>
<td>6254(f) 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.610</td>
<td>6254(f) 3d ¶ (re 6254(f)(1)), 6254(f)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.615(a)</td>
<td>6254(f) 3d ¶ (re 6254(f)(2)), 6254(f)(2(A) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.615(b)</td>
<td>6254(f)(2(A) 2d, 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.615(c)</td>
<td>6254(f)(2(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.620(a)</td>
<td>6254(f) 3d ¶ (re 6254(f)(3)), 6254(f)(3) 1st, 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.620(b)</td>
<td>6254(f)(3) 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.620(c)</td>
<td>6254(f)(3) 4th sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.625</td>
<td>6254(f)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.630</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.650</td>
<td>6262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.655</td>
<td>6254.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.655(a)</td>
<td>6254.30 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.655(b)</td>
<td>6254.30 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.700</td>
<td>6254(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.750</td>
<td>6254.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.755</td>
<td>6254.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.800-7923.805</td>
<td>6254(u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923.800</td>
<td>6254(u)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.000</td>
<td>6254(u)(2)-(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.005</td>
<td>6254.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.100</td>
<td>6253.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.105</td>
<td>6253.5(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.110(a)-(b)</td>
<td>6253.5(a) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.110(c)</td>
<td>6253.5(a) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.110(d)</td>
<td>6253.5(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.300-7924.335</td>
<td>6254.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.300</td>
<td>6254.2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.305(a)</td>
<td>6254.2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.305(b)</td>
<td>6254.2(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.305(c)</td>
<td>6254.2(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.305(d)</td>
<td>6254.2(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.305(e)</td>
<td>6254.2(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.305(f)</td>
<td>6254.2(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.310(a)-(b)</td>
<td>6254.2(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.310(c)</td>
<td>6254.2(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.315</td>
<td>6254.2(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.320</td>
<td>6254.2(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.325</td>
<td>6254.2(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.330</td>
<td>6254.2(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.335</td>
<td>6254.2(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.500</td>
<td>6254.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.505</td>
<td>6254(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510</td>
<td>6254.7 (except (c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510(a)</td>
<td>6254.7(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510(b)</td>
<td>6254.7(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510(c)</td>
<td>6254.7(d) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510(d)</td>
<td>6254.7(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510(e)</td>
<td>6254.7(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.510(f)</td>
<td>6254.7(d) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.700</td>
<td>6254.7(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7924.900</td>
<td>6253.8(a)-(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7925.000</td>
<td>6254(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7925.005</td>
<td>6254(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7925.010</td>
<td>6254(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.000</td>
<td>6254(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.100</td>
<td>6254(ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.200</td>
<td>6254 last ¶ (unlabeled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.205</td>
<td>6254.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.205(a)</td>
<td>6254.22 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.205(b)</td>
<td>6254.22 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.205(c)</td>
<td>6254.22 3d &amp; 4th sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.210</td>
<td>6254(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.215</td>
<td>6254.14(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.215(a)</td>
<td>6254.14(a)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.215(b)</td>
<td>6254.14(a)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.215(c)</td>
<td>6254.14(a)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.215(d)</td>
<td>6254.14(a)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.215(e)</td>
<td>6254.14(a)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.220(a)</td>
<td>6254(q)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.220(b)</td>
<td>6254(q)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.220(c)</td>
<td>6254(q)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.220(d)</td>
<td>6254(q)(4),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6254.14(b) (re 6254(q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.225(a)</td>
<td>6254(v)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.225(b)</td>
<td>6254(v)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.225(c)</td>
<td>6254(v)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.225(d)</td>
<td>6254(v)(4),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6254.14(b) (re 6254(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.230(a)</td>
<td>6254(y)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.230(b)</td>
<td>6254(y)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.230(c)</td>
<td>6254(y)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.230(d)</td>
<td>6254(y)(4),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6254.14(b) (re 6254(y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.230(e)</td>
<td>6254(y)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.235</td>
<td>6254(w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.235(a)</td>
<td>6254(w)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.235(b)</td>
<td>6254(w)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.235(c)</td>
<td>6254(w)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.300</td>
<td>6253.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.400-7926.430</td>
<td>6254.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.400</td>
<td>6254.18(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.400(a)</td>
<td>6254.18(b)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.400(b)</td>
<td>6254.18(b)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.400(c)</td>
<td>6254.18(b)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.400(d)</td>
<td>6254.18(b)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.405</td>
<td>6254.18(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.410</td>
<td>6254.18(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.415</td>
<td>6254.18(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.415(a)</td>
<td>6254.18(d)(1) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.415(b)</td>
<td>6254.18(d)(3) 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.415(c)</td>
<td>6254.18(d)(2) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.420</td>
<td>6254.18(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.425</td>
<td>6254.18(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.430</td>
<td>6254.18(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7926.500</td>
<td>6270.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.000</td>
<td>6254(r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3: CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION’S DERIVATION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7927.005</td>
<td>6254.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.100</td>
<td>6254(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.105</td>
<td>6267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.200</td>
<td>6254(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.205</td>
<td>6254.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.300</td>
<td>6254(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.305</td>
<td>6253.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.400</td>
<td>6254.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.405</td>
<td>6254.1(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.410</td>
<td>6254.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.415</td>
<td>6254.1(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.420</td>
<td>6252.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.500</td>
<td>6254(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.600</td>
<td>6254.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.605</td>
<td>6254.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.700</td>
<td>6254(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7927.705</td>
<td>6254(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.000</td>
<td>6254(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.005-7928.010</td>
<td>6268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.005</td>
<td>6268(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.010(a)</td>
<td>6268(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.010(b)</td>
<td>6268(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.015</td>
<td>6268.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.100</td>
<td>6254(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.200-7928.230</td>
<td>6254.21 (except (f))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.200(a)</td>
<td>6254.21(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.200(b)</td>
<td>6254.21(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.205</td>
<td>6254.21(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.210</td>
<td>6254.21(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215-7928.225</td>
<td>6254.21(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215(a)</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215(b)</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215(c)</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215(d)</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.215(e)</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(1)(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.220</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.225</td>
<td>6254.21(c)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.230</td>
<td>6254.21(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.300</td>
<td>6254.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.400</td>
<td>6254.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.405</td>
<td>6254(p)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.410</td>
<td>6254(p)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.700</td>
<td>6253.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.705</td>
<td>6254(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.710(a)</td>
<td>6254.26(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.710(b)</td>
<td>6254.26(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.710(c)</td>
<td>6254.26(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.715</td>
<td>6254.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.720</td>
<td>6261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7928.800</td>
<td>6270.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.000</td>
<td>6254(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.005</td>
<td>6254.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PROVISION(S)</td>
<td>PROPOSED PROVISION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.010</td>
<td>6254.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.200</td>
<td>6254(aa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.205</td>
<td>6254(ab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.205(a)</td>
<td>6254(ab) 2d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.205(b)</td>
<td>6254(ab) 1st sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.205(c)</td>
<td>6254(ab) 3d sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.210</td>
<td>6254.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.215</td>
<td>6254.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.400-7929.430</td>
<td>6254(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.400</td>
<td>6254(ad)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.405</td>
<td>6254(ad)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.410</td>
<td>6254(ad)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.415</td>
<td>6254(ad)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.420</td>
<td>6254(ad)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.425</td>
<td>6254(ad)(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.430</td>
<td>6254(ad)(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.600</td>
<td>6254.1(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.605</td>
<td>6254(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7929.610</td>
<td>6254.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.000-7930.215</td>
<td>6275-6276.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.000</td>
<td>6275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.005</td>
<td>6276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.100</td>
<td>6276.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.105</td>
<td>6276.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.110</td>
<td>6276.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.115</td>
<td>6276.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.120</td>
<td>6276.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.125</td>
<td>6276.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.130</td>
<td>6276.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.135</td>
<td>6276.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.140</td>
<td>6276.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.145</td>
<td>6276.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.150</td>
<td>6276.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.155</td>
<td>6276.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.160</td>
<td>6276.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.165</td>
<td>6276.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.170</td>
<td>6276.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.175</td>
<td>6276.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.180</td>
<td>6276.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.185</td>
<td>6276.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.190</td>
<td>6276.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.195</td>
<td>6276.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.200</td>
<td>6276.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.205</td>
<td>6276.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.210</td>
<td>6276.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7930.215</td>
<td>6276.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is “Section 1090”?

Government Code Section 1090 provides, in part, that “[m]embers of the Legislature, state, county, district, judicial district, and city officers or employees shall not be financially interested in any contract made by them in their official capacity, or by any body or board of which they are members.”

What is the purpose of Section 1090?

Section 1090 “codifies the long-standing common law rule that barred public officials from being personally financially interested in the contracts they formed in their official capacities.”

The prohibition is based on the rationale that a person cannot effectively serve two masters at the same time. Therefore, Section 1090 is designed to apply to any situation that “would prevent the officials involved from exercising absolute loyalty and undivided allegiance to the best interests of the [public entity concerned].” Section 1090’s goals include eliminating temptation, avoiding the appearance of impropriety, and assuring the public of the official’s undivided and uncompromised allegiance.

Furthermore, Section 1090 is intended “not only to strike at actual impropriety, but also to strike at the appearance of impropriety.”

What if a contract violates Section 1090?

A contract that violates Section 1090 is void. The prohibition applies even when the terms of the proposed contract are demonstrably fair and equitable or are plainly to the public entity’s advantage.

What are the consequences of a violation?

Apart from voiding the contract, where a prohibited interest is found, the official who engaged in its making is subject to a host of civil and (if the violation was willful) criminal penalties, including imprisonment and disqualification from holding public office in perpetuity. The FPPC also may impose administrative penalties for violations of Section 1090.
How is Section 1090 applied and analyzed?

Courts have recognized that Section 1090’s prohibition must be broadly construed and strictly enforced.\textsuperscript{11} “An important, prophylactic statute such as Section 1090 should be construed broadly to close loopholes; it should not be constricted and enfeebled.”\textsuperscript{12} With this in mind, the determination of whether Section 1090 prohibits a particular contract generally requires the following questions to be analyzed:

1. \textbf{Is the official subject to the provisions of Section 1090?}

Section 1090 applies to virtually all state and local officers, employees, and multimember bodies, whether elected or appointed, at both the state and local level.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|p{0.9\textwidth}|}
\hline
\textbf{Independent Contractors} \\
\hline
In addition, the California Supreme Court recently affirmed that Section 1090’s reference to “officers” applies to “outside advisors [independent contractors, including corporate consultants] with responsibilities for public contracting similar to those belonging to formal officers.”\textsuperscript{13} In other words, liability extends only to independent contractors who can be said to have been entrusted with “transact[ing] on behalf of the Government.”\textsuperscript{14}

Occasionally, the Commission receives a request for advice asking whether a public entity that has entered a contract with an independent contractor to perform one phase of a project may enter a second contract with that independent contractor for a subsequent phase of the same project. In these situations, we generally employ a two-step test.

The first step, just discussed, is a determination of whether the independent contractor had responsibilities for public contracting on behalf of the public entity under the initial contract. If the answer is “no,” the independent contractor is not subject to Section 1090 and the public entity may enter the subsequent contract with them for the same project. However, if any part of their contractual duties or responsibilities under the first contract involved public contracting, then the independent contractor is subject to Section 1090, and the analysis proceeds to the second step.

Under the second step, the analysis focuses on whether the independent contractor participated in making the subsequent contract for purposes of Section 1090, as discussed below, through its performance of the initial contract. If the answer is “no,” the public entity may enter the subsequent contract with them for the same project. However, if the independent contractor is found to have participated in the making of the contract for purposes of Section 1090, the public entity may not enter into the subsequent contract.
2. Does the decision involve a contract?

To determine whether a contract is involved in a decision, the Section 1090 analysis applies general principles of contract law\(^\text{15}\), while keeping in mind that “specific rules applicable to Sections 1090 and 1097 require that we view the transactions in a broad manner and avoid narrow and technical definitions of ‘contract.’”\(^\text{16}\) Under general principles of law, a contract is made on the mutual assent of the parties and consideration.

3. Is the official making or participating in the making of a contract?

Section 1090 reaches beyond the officials who participate personally in the execution of the contract to include officials who participate in the making of the contract.

In *Sahlolbei, supra*, the Supreme Court explained that Section 1090 is to be construed broadly, including the meaning of what constitutes the “making” of a contract:

Recognizing the prophylactic purposes of conflicts statutes, the case law makes clear that section 1090 should be construed broadly to ensure that the public has the official’s “absolute loyalty and undivided allegiance.” (*Stigall v. City of Taft* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 565, 569.) The focus is on the substance, not the form, of the challenged transaction, “disregard[ing] the technical relationships of the parties and look[ing] behind the veil which enshrouds their activities.” (*People v. Watson* (1971) 15 Cal.App.3d 28, 37.) To that end, we have held that the “making” of a contract for the purposes of section 1090 includes “planning, preliminary discussions, compromises, drawing of plans and specifications and solicitation of bids,” and not just the moment of signing. (*Stigall*, at p. 571.) Building on *Stigall*, the Courts of Appeal have explained that officials can be liable if they “had the opportunity to, and did, influence execution [of the contract] directly or indirectly to promote [their] personal interests.” (*People v. Sobel* (1974) 40 Cal.App.3d 1046, 1052.)\(^\text{17}\)

Therefore, “the test is whether the officer or employee participated in the making of the contract in (their) official capacity.”\(^\text{18}\)

A decision to modify, extend or renegotiate a contract constitutes involvement in the making of a contract under section 1090.\(^\text{19}\)

When members of a public board, commission or similar body have the power to execute contracts, each member is conclusively presumed to be involved in the making of all contracts by his or her agency regardless of whether the member participates in the making of the contract.\(^\text{20}\) In most cases, this presumption cannot be avoided by having the interested board member abstain from the decision. Rather, the entire governing body is precluded from entering the contract.\(^\text{21}\) However, if an agency
employee is financially interested in a contract, the employee’s agency is not prohibited from making the contract so long as the employee does not participate in his or her official capacity.22

A governing body cannot avoid application of Section 1090 by delegating its contracting authority to another individual or body.23 However, it may avoid violating Section 1090 if the contract is made by an “independent” government official and that official does not have a conflict of interest.24

Resigning from a governmental position may not be sufficient to avoid a violation.25

4. Does the official have a financial interest in the contract?

Under Section 1090, “the prohibited act is the making of a contract in which the official has a financial interest,” and officials are deemed to have a financial interest in a contract if they might profit from it in any way.26 Although Section 1090 does not specifically define the term “financial interest,” case law and Attorney General Opinions state that prohibited financial interests may be indirect as well as direct, and may involve financial losses, or the possibility of losses, as well as the prospect of pecuniary gain.27 “However devious and winding the chain may be which connects the officer with the forbidden contract, if it can be followed and the connection made, the contract is void.”28

Employees generally have a financial interest in a contract that involves their employer, even where the contract would not result in a change in income or directly involve the employee, because an employee has an overall interest in the financial success of the firm and continued employment.29 A member of a governing body always has a financial interest in his or her spouse’s source of income for purposes of Section 1090.30

5. Does a statutory exception apply, such as a remote or noninterest exception?

The Legislature has created various statutory exceptions to Section 1090’s prohibition where the financial interest involved is deemed a “remote interest” under Section 1091, or a “noninterest” under Section 1091.5. If a “remote interest,” is present, the contract may be made if (1) the officer in question discloses his or her financial interest in the contract to the public agency, (2) such interest is noted in the entity’s official records, and (3) the officer abstains from any participation in the making of the contract.31 If a “noninterest” is present, the contract may be made without the officer’s abstention, and generally, a noninterest does not require disclosure.32

Remote interests apply only to members of multi-member bodies. Common remote interests in contracts include those situations where an official is:

- An officer or employee of a nonprofit corporation.
• Employed by a private contracting party that has 10 or more employees (other than the official) where he or she has been employed for at least three years prior to initially joining the public body, owns less than 3% of the stock, is not an officer or director, and did not directly participate in formulating the bid of the private contracting party.

• A landlord or tenant of a contracting party.

• A supplier of goods or services that have been supplied to the contracting party by the official for at least five years prior to his or her election or appointment to office.

Common noninterests in contracts include those situations where an official is:

• A recipient of public services generally provided by the public body or board of which they are a member, on the same terms and conditions as all other recipients.

• A noncompensated officer of a nonprofit tax-exempt corporation, which has at least one primary purpose that supports the functions of the body or board or to which the body or board has a legal obligation to give particular consideration.

6. Does the “Rule of Necessity” Apply?

In limited cases, the “rule of necessity” has been applied to allow the making of a contract that Section 1090 would otherwise prohibit. The rule has been applied where public policy concerns authorize the contract and “ensures that essential government functions are performed even where a conflict of interest exists.” The rule of necessity permits a government body to act to carry out its essential functions if no other entity is competent to do so.

---

1 Gov. Code Section 1090(a).
3 See id., at p. 1073 (“If a public official is pulled in one direction by his financial interest and in another direction by his official duties, his judgment cannot and should not be trusted, even if he attempts impartiality”).
4 Stigall v. City of Taft (1962) 58 Cal.2d 565, 569.
7 Thomson, supra, 38 Cal.3d at p. 646.
8 Id., at pp. 646-649.
11 Stigall, supra, 58 Cal.2d at pp. 569-571.
13 People v. Superior Court (Sahlolbe) (2017) 3 Cal.5th 230, 237-240.
14 Id. at p. 240.
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