## FW: Rules Committee - public comment - Item I.1 January-June 2020 Open Government Report.

Taber, Toni
Wed 9/16/2020 11:10 AM
To:Agendadesk <

Public record for today's open government report.

From: City Clerk

Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 10:53 AM

To: Taber, Toni <

Cc: Rodriguez, Joy < Ramirez, Rachel <

Subject: FW: Rules Committee - public comment - Item I.1 January-June 2020 Open Government Report.

Not sure we need to do anything with this, since she cc'd everyone, but please let me know if there is someone in particular you would like me to forward this email to, and I will take care of it.

Thank you!

;-)

From: Robin Roemer [mailto:

Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 10:46 AM

To: City Clerk < District4 <
Cc: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo < District 10 < District 6 <

Online Of the Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo < District 8

Subject: Rules Committee - public comment - Item I.1 January-June 2020 Open Government Report.

[External Email]

Hi,

for the past year or so, I've been regularly (about every 10-14 days) been checking Councilmember Diep's public calendar and I have concerns about the Jan-June report attesting a 100% rate for his calendar as his calendar for the longest time only had information about standing and recurring meetings - and even some of that was wrong.

After I became aware of the legal requirement for calendar disclosures, I brought this to the attention of the Open Government Manager at the end of August (see emails below). The D4 calendar has been substantially updated and filled since then.

I'm not suspecting any malicious intent and assume this was just an oversight. I also want to thank the Councilmember for the transparency the calendar provides, but I would be interested to hear from staff how the 100% compliance for Jan-June

was assessed even though the calendar entries were not publicly visible and how they have been able to retroactively correct the issue.
Thank you,
Robin Roemer
Forwarded Message
From: PublicRecordsRequest <
To: Robin Roemer <> Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020, 8:57:48 AM PDT
Subject: Re: PRA Appeal
Good morning Robin,
Sorry for not getting back to you yesterday. I'm still waiting to hear from the City Clerk regarding the timing. However, I believe you will receive more than the 2 minutes. I will let you know when I hear back.
The Open Government Manager is responsible for checking public calendar compliance. Thank you for bringing this to my attention. I will follow up with the Councilmember's Office.
Best, Amanda
From: Robin Roemer <>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 9:26 PM
To: PublicRecordsRequest < Cc: PublicRecordsRequest <
Subject: Re: PRA Appeal
[External Email]

Hi Amanda,

thank you so much for scheduling this. I was wondering if as the person appealing I would also be limited to the typical 2 minutes oral comment or if I would have more time to make my case?

Also, as I was reading the Consolidated Open Government and Ethics Provisions, I noticed that Councilmember are obligated to regularly update their public calendar (1.3.3 p. 26 in <a href="https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=33306">https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=33306</a>). I further noticed that Councilmember Diep seems to have neglected to update his calendar in the past few months (<a href="https://outlook.office365.com/calendar/published/">https://outlook.office365.com/calendar/published/</a>

For example, I'm a member of some of the neighborhood associations that are mentioned and I know that some of those meetings either didn't happen at all or that the Councilmember didn't actually attend. It also includes e.g. wrong information about City Council meetings in July.
What would be the appropriate way to ensure that Councilmember Diep fulfills his obligations in this regard?
Thank you,
Robin

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