



**Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Sunshine Task Force  
Committee will conduct a Special Meeting, at the following time and place, and will  
address the agenda listed below:**

**City Hall  
455 North Rexford Drive  
Municipal Gallery  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210**

**March 15, 2018  
5:30pm**

**AGENDA**

- 1. Oral Communications**  
Members of the public will be given an opportunity to address the Committee on any item listed on the agenda.
- 2. Discussion on the following: (1) add an attestation to the application form that no member of a developer/contractor's team has been subject to a disciplinary action on any development in any city; (2) disciplinary actions by the Community Preservation Office should be available in the City's online property database; and (3) a contractor (e.g., West Coast Arborist) who violates the code, breaks state law, and places its workers at risk should not be involved in any way in the City**
- 3. Discussion on requiring the following information be provided by a registered legislative advocate: (1) has the lobbyist worked on a campaign of any Councilmember or Commissioner they are appearing before? (2) has the lobbyist donated time or money to any Councilmember or Commissioner they are appearing before? (3) has the lobbyist had a social or personal friendship outside of City Hall with any Councilmember or Commissioner they appear before?**
- 4. Suggestion for City staff to provide residents notice of topics being placed on the agenda at least 72 hours before packet goes out to City Council**
- 5. Discussion on expanding access to city data under the "open gov" initiative**
- 6. Discussion on when is it appropriate to expect from a city official the provision of information relating to a policy or program versus the advisability of filing a public records request as the first step to gaining that information**
- 7. Discussion of Assembly Bill re. land use/zoning regulations**
- 8. BHUSD**
- 9. Voter Fraud**
- 10. Adjournment**

  
Byron Pope, City Clerk

Posted: March 2, 2018

***A DETAILED LIAISON AGENDA PACKET IS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW IN THE LIBRARY AND CITY CLERK'S OFFICE***



In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please call the City Manager's Office at (310) 285-1014. Please notify the City Manager's Office at least twenty-four hours (24) prior to the meeting so that reasonable arrangements can be made to ensure accessibility.

Original Message-

From: Mark Elliot [mailto:mark.elliott@betterbike.org]

Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 12:32 PM

To: Lourdes Sy-Rodriguez <lsyrodriquez@beverlyhills.org>

Cc: John Mirisch <jmirisch@beverlyhills.org>; Liii Bosse [lbose@beverlyhills.org](mailto:lbose@beverlyhills.org)

2) Expanding access to city data under the 'open gov' initiative.

Currently that initiative seems limited to financial reports. But other data is accessible only by public records request, which seems excessive. For example, the public would benefit from knowing how many involuntary terminations are being handed to tenants and some basic information from rental unit registry records (such as whether a property is even registered). Likewise, police maintain and report collision injuries, but only totals. So we don't know where the harm is occurring. Real time reporting would be very helpful from a safety standpoint. Another example: as the city continues to focus on business registration compliance, the city's online search tool has actually become less informative. This tool was crucial to identifying how many property lessors were not licensed. Where the business license search tool had provided business start date, telephone number and website, today those fields are gone. Other city search tools are not functioning properly (according to Mr. Schirmer). Every search tool should function as intended. Another instance: there exist two different (but identical looking) public facing GIS sites that make available building permit records. Yet the permits listed actually varies from one to the other. Which is correct? We don't know.

**From:** Mark Elliot <mark.elliott@betterbike.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 28, 2018 7:26 PM  
**To:** Lourdes Sy-Rodriguez  
**Subject:** Re: Sunshine Task Force Committee Meeting

Hello Lourdes,

Can I add a bit of supplemental language to my agenda suggestions for the benefit of the task force please?

- > • Discussion on expanding access to city data under the "open gov" initiative – from Mark Elliot/carryover from previous agenda
- >

A presidential executive order in 2013 proclaimed that "open and machine-readable" public data would be the "new default" for the federal government. The objectives of that order: strengthen democracy, promote efficient service delivery, and fuel public-private innovation. Our 'Open Beverly Hills' initiative falls short on the second and third points but making more city data accessible and available for query would be a good new default for our city.

- > • Discussion on when is it appropriate to expect from a city official the provision of information relating to a policy or program versus the advisability of filing a public records request as the first step to gaining that information – from Mark Elliot/carried over from previous agenda

City Hall generally does a satisfactory job of responding to public records requests. But there are many instances where a request for information could be accommodated more expeditiously at the department level with a simple request. There seems to be no standard practice, however, which may result in an unnecessarily large number of requests - and a too-long wait. Should we have a policy or practice to share information short of a records request?

Thanks very much,

Mark Elliot

-----Original Message-----

From: mark.elliott@betterbike.org [mailto:mark.elliott@betterbike.org]

Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2018 2:07 PM

To: Lourdes Sy-Rodriguez <lsyrodiguez@beverlyhills.org>

Subject: Public information requests

Hello Lourdes,

I have another transparency-related discussion topic: When is it appropriate to expect from a city official the provision of information relating to a policy or program versus the advisability of filing a public records request as the first step to gaining that information.

For example, I have contacted a couple of CDD officials for an update on rent stabilization program progress. I also have specific and substantive questions about the policy and enforcement. But I'm not hearing anything back on my contacts. Generally I prefer informal exchanges and so reach out first.

But I have resorted to the records request more frequently out of necessity - fishing for policy implementation documentation and communications between the city and the public and so on. In my view that is a last resort.

What should a member of the public expect in the way of receiving policy or process information when it is not confidential or otherwise advisably withheld? Is the public records request the city's preferred means of providing such information (for whatever reason)?

Thanks very much,

Mark Elliot