1 2 3 4	Edward E. Yates, Esquire SB# 135138 LAW OFFICE OF EDWARD E. YATES 1000 Fourth St., Suite 800 San Rafael, CA 94901 Telephone: (415) 526-6314 Email: evates@marinlandlaw.com DEC 1 6 2014 KIM LUNDER, COURT EXECUTIVE Officer
5	Attorney for Petitioner MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT By: R. Smith, Deputy
6	COMMUNITY VENTURES PARTNERS, NC.
7	
8	
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF MARIN
10	4/0/-
11	CV 1404718
12	COMMUNITY VENTURES PARTNERS,) VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE;
13) INJUNCTIVE AND Petitioner/Plaintiff, DECLARATORY RELIEF FOR
14) VIOLATIONS OF THE
15) RALPH M. BROWN ACT) WITH EXHIBITS A THROUGH J
16	COUNTY OF MARIN,)
17) [Cal. Government Code Section 54950, et seq.] Respondent/Defendant.
18)
19	
20	
21	This action seeks relief from the failure of Respondent/Defendant, COUNTY
22	OF MARIN, to perform as required by the California Government Code Sections 54950, et seq
23	Petitioner, COMMUNITY VENTURES PARTNERS, INC., seeks a writ of mandate, injunctive
24	declaratory relief, costs and attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure Sections
25	The second secon

1085 and 1060 and Government Code Sections 54960 and 54960.1. In this Verified Petition,

26

27

28

Petitioner alleges as follows:

///

INTRODUCTION

1. At its meeting of August 19, 2014, the Marin County Board of Supervisors ("Board") made a surprise announcement that it had planned for a discussion of an item that was not on the August 19, 2014 Agenda ("Agenda") and for which no public notice was given. The item was the Draft 2015 - 2023 Housing Element and included a formal prepared presentation by the Planning Director, Brian Crawford. Much of this presentation was to dispute points made by Petitioner in a letter of August 12, 2014. Petitioner and other members of the public were not informed of this discussion item and thus, did not have the opportunity to attend or comment on the subject matter of this presentation and discussion item. This violates the public's right to participate in the agenda items and decision-making process of its local agencies, a right guaranteed by the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code Section 54950, et seq.) ("Brown Act") and the California Constitution. Therefore, Petitioner seeks a declaration that the Board's actions violated the Brown Act, and injunctive and declaratory relief for an order requiring the Respondent to cease and desist in such future actions.

THE PARTIES

2. Petitioner, COMMUNITY VENTURES PARTNERS, INC., ("CVP") at all times mentioned in this petition, has been, a 501(c)(3) non-profit public benefit corporation organized under the laws of California, governed by a board comprised of public-minded, local citizens whose mission includes the promotion and defense of the principles of open government. Its offices are located at 73 Surrey Avenue, Mill Valley CA 94941.

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

- 3. Respondent/Defendant, COUNTY OF MARIN, ("Respondent" or "COUNTY") is defined as a "local agency" by Government Code § 54951 and is therefore subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. The County's main offices are located at 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 329, San Rafael, CA 94903.
- 4. The COUNTY Board of Supervisors is a legislative body as defined by Government Code §§ 54952, 54954.2(d), as it is the governing body of the COUNTY, a local agency, and thus subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1085 and 1060 and Government Code Sections 6258 and 6259.
- 4. Venue is proper under Government Code Section 6259, as the records are located within the County of Marin. However, the lawsuit is subject to transfer of venue.

FACTS SUPPORTING THE CAUSE OF ACTION

5. On August 12, 2014, Petitioner, CVP, sent a letter to COUNTY regarding the COUNTY Draft 2015 - 2023 Housing Element ("Housing Element"). CVP's letter addressed issues such as the number of units required under housing element law and the timeline required for adoption of the Housing Element by the County. A true and correct copy of the CVP letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

///

- 6. In August, 2014 COUNTY published the Agenda for the August 19, 2014 meeting of the COUNTY Board of Supervisors ("Agenda"). The Agenda did not include an agenda item related to the Housing Element or a "brief description" of each item to be discussed or acted upon or regarding the Housing Element. A true and correct copy of the Agenda for August 19, 2014 is attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference.
- 7. On August 19, 2014, the Marin County Board of Supervisors convened a meeting noticed by the above mentioned Agenda. No notice was provided to the public regarding discussion or deliberation regarding the 2015 2023 Housing Element. A true and correct copy of the COUNTY Minutes for the August 19, 2014 Board of Supervisors meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by reference.
- 8. The following events occurred at the August 19, 2014 COUNTY Board of Supervisors meeting. COUNTY Board of Supervisors: 1) discussed Housing Element issues with COUNTY Staff for approximately 26 minutes; 2) requested and listened to a formal presentation by the COUNTY Community Development Director, Brian Crawford; 3) engaged in lengthy discussion with Mr. Crawford and COUNTY Principal Planner, Lee Lee Thomas; and 4) discussed and opined on Housing Element issues that were under consideration by the County Planning Commission. A true and correct copy of a timeline identifying the actions at the August 19, 2014 meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit D and incorporated herein by reference.
- 9. First, during the Supervisors' Report, agenda item #2 (Minutes 4:00-9:17), Supervisors Rice and Arnold described the need to educate the public on the subject of the Housing Element. Neither Supervisor Rice nor Arnold described her discussions as a report from a subcommittee or personal interaction or Board assignment. At Minute 4:17, Supervisor

Rice stated, "I am glad to see Mr. Crawford here to speak about the Housing Element process."

At Minute 5:18, Supervisor Rice stated, "I just wanted to make one more comment on this item."

- 10. Second, at Minute 14:40, COUNTY Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Matthew Hymel, stated, "Supervisor Rice has asked the Community Development Director Brian Crawford to discuss the Housing Element." Mr. Hymel then introduced Mr. Crawford.
- 11. Third, at Minutes 14:50-25:40, Community Development Director, Brian Crawford, opened a folder, read off prepared, written notes and discussed specific timelines, policies and legal issues regarding the Housing Element. The formal and prepared nature of the presentation was made clear by Mr. Crawford's reading a prepared, written presentation on the topic of the Housing Element. At Minute 14:50, Mr. Crawford stated, "Thank you members of the Board for the opportunity to address your Board on the status of the Housing Element." At Minute 18:50, Mr. Crawford referenced a meeting with County Counsel wherein he received advice regarding issues brought up by Petitioner in recent letters (See Exhibit A). At Minute 25:30, Mr. Crawford stated, "With that I'll complete my comments."
- 12. Fourth, at Minutes 25:50-30:00, COUNTY Board of Supervisors engaged in a Question and Answer period regarding the 2015 2023 Housing Element with Mr. Crawford and COUNTY Principal Planner, Lee Lee Thomas. The Minutes for the August 19, 2014 meeting (Exhibit C) state, "Mr. Hymel introduced Community Development Agency Director Brian Crawford, who provided an update on the status of the Draft Housing Element. Mr. Crawford and Ms. Thomas responded to questions from Board members regarding various components of the Draft Housing Element."

13. Fifth, at Minutes 1:07-1:12:30, COUNTY Supervisors engaged in discussion regarding Mr. Crawford's presentation of Housing Element and provided opinions about COUNTY compliance with Housing Element requirements, Housing Element policy preferences, and the adequacy of the Housing Element public participation process. This discussion did not briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their public testimony rights.

- 14. On September 18, 2014, Petitioner, through its legal counsel, sent a letter to COUNTY, which included a Demand to Cease and Desist pursuant to Government Code § 54960.2 ("Demand") to the Board. A true and correct copy of the Demand is attached hereto as Exhibit E and incorporated herein by reference.
- 15. In the Demand letter, Petitioner requested that the COUNTY Board of Supervisors "cease and desist" violations of the Ralph M. Brown Act. Petitioner requested written notice, sent by direct mail, email, and an ad in the Marin Independent Journal of any ntention to cease and desist or not cease and desist these actions.
- 16. County Counsel, Stephen Woodside, was reported by the Marin Independent Journal in a newspaper article of September 24, 2014 "saying Yates' Brown Act complaint is all bark and no bite, asserted nothing illegal or otherwise inappropriate was done regarding the board's "off agenda" exchange." The article quoted Mr. Woodside: "I looked at the tape of the meeting," Woodside said. "Nothing illegal was done." A true and correct copy of the September 24, 2014 article is attached hereto as Exhibit F and incorporated herein by reference.
- 17. Petitioner has not received any response from COUNTY Board of Supervisors regarding Petitioner's Cease and Desist letter of September 18, 2014. A true and correct copy of

an email from Petitioner's counsel to Mr. Woodside is attached hereto as Exhibit G and incorporated herein by reference.

- 18. On November 13, 2014, Petitioner's Counsel sent a Public Records Act request letter to COUNTY requesting a copy of the video file of the August 19, 2014 hearing. "A true and correct copy of the November 13, 2014 letter is attached as Exhibit H and incorporated herein by reference.
- 19. Petitioner's Public Records Act (PRA) request was denied by COUNTY. A true and correct copy of an email thread regarding the PRA request is attached as Exhibit I and incorporated herein by reference.
- 20. On December 15, 2014 Petitioner's attorney of record called County Counsel's office and asked if a letter had been sent from the Board of Supervisors to Petitioner responding to the Demand. Deputy County Counsel Steven Perl replied that a response was sent from Mr. Woodside, not the Board of Supervisors, and that Mr. Woodside's administrative assistant would verify that the letter was sent. Mr. Perl email an unsigned copy of a letter from Mr. Woodside to Petitioner's attorney that same day. Petitioner cannot confirm that this letter was sent as Petitioner's attorney never received it. A true and correct copy of an email thread regarding the Demand is attached as Exhibit J and incorporated herein by reference.
- 21. The purpose of the Ralph M. Brown Act is to provide notice and opportunity for members of the public to participate in the decision-making process of local agencies. The failure to properly notice this matter, as well as the formal presentation and discussion of COUNTY's legal requirements and policy considerations, violates the Brown Act in that it deprives the notice and the opportunity to be heard regarding matters of great public importance.

CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA RALPH M. BROWN ACT (RELIEF PURSUANT TO GOV. CODE §§ 54960, 54960.1, 54960.2; CCP SECTIONS 1060, 1085)

- 22. Petitioner hereby realleges and incorporates herein by reference Paragraphs 1 through 21 of this Petition as though set forth herein in full.
- 23. The Brown Act creates specific agenda obligations for notifying the public with a "brief description" of each item to be discussed or acted upon. Government Code § 54954.2(a)(1).
- 24. The Board violated Government Code § 54952.2 by discussing COUNTY'S 2015 2023 Housing Element and State law requirements for Housing Element compliance, without properly listing it on any agenda or providing a brief description or providing any public notice.
 - 25. Government Code § 54954.2(a) (2) reads as follows:

"No action or discussion shall be undertaken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except that members of a legislative body or its staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their public testimony rights under Section 54954.3. In addition, on their own initiative or in response to questions posed by the public, a member of a legislative body or its staff may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement, or make a brief report on his or her own activities. Furthermore, a member of a legislative body, or the body itself, subject to rules or procedures of the legislative body, may provide a reference to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff

to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter, or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda."

- 26. The lengthy discussions by Board members regarding Housing Element policy preferences, legal compliance, public participation, and the formal presentation specifically requested by a Board member and the lengthy prepared response by COUNTY staff clearly do not qualify as making "a brief announcement," "a brief report on his or her own activities," or asking "a question for clarification" as allowed for under Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(2).
- 27. Petitioner alleges that these violations of the Brown Act, as set forth above, ignore the State's open meeting laws, and have deprived Petitioner and members of the public of proper notice and of their right to address the Board on Housing Element compliance and implementation by COUNTY.
- 28. Without a writ of mandate and declaratory and injunctive relief provided for by the Brown Act, Petitioner is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that it and other interested persons, citizens, and taxpayers will be irreparably harmed because they will be denied notice of and the opportunity to participate in the Board's meetings, a right guaranteed by law.
- 29. Government Code Section 54960(a) provides that any interested person, such as the Petitioner, may commence an action by mandamus, injunction, or declaratory relief for the purpose of stopping or preventing violations or threatened violations of this chapter by members of the legislative body of a local agency or to determine the applicability of this chapter to actions or threatened future action of the legislative body, or to 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 or invalid under the laws of this State or of the United States, or to compel the legislative body to audio record its closed sessions as hereinafter provided.

- 30. Because the Board has failed to acknowledge its violations of the Brown Act, the Board is likely to continue to violate the Brown Act in the future.
- 31. Because legal counsel for the Board has stated that the Board's actions did not constitute violations of the Brown Act, it is likely the Board will continue to violate the Brown Act in the future.
- 32. Petitioner has complied with all notice and demand requirements set forth in Government Code Section 54960.1.
- 33. The Board has also failed to make an unconditional commitment to refrain from similar behavior in the future, as required by Petitioner's Demand and Government Code Section 54960.2.
- 34. Therefore, Government Code Section 54960.2 specifically authorizes Petitioner to file a lawsuit to determine the applicability of this chapter to any past action if the legislative body fails or refuses to make the unconditional commitment as described in Petitioner's Demand and Government Code Section 54960.2.
- 35. The people of California have elevated the right to open government to one protected by their State Constitution. The California Constitution, Article 1, Section 7, Paragraphs (a) (b), states:

The people have the right to instruct their representatives, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good.

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.

A statute, court rule, or other authority, including those in effect on the effective date of this subdivision, shall be broadly construed if it furthers the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access.

36. Code of Civil Procedure Section 1060 provides:

Any person interested ... who desires a declaration of his or her rights or duties with respect to another ... may, in cases of actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties, bring an original action or cross-complaint in the superior court for a declaration of his or her rights and duties in the premises, including a determination of any question of construction or validity arising under the instrument or contract. He or she may ask for a declaration of rights or duties, either alone or with other relief; and the court may make a binding declaration of these rights or duties, whether or not further relief is or could be claimed at the time.

- 37. There presently exists, between the Petitioner and the Board, an actual controversy relating to: (1) the legal rights of Petitioner and other members of the public under the Brown Act and the California Public Records Act; and (2) the Ministerial duties imposed upon the Board by the Brown Act.
- 38. Petitioner requests a judicial determination that Respondent has violated and is likely to continue to violate the Brown Act.

- 39. This determination is necessary and proper because Respondent refuses to conform to the requirements of the Brown Act.
- 40. Respondent has a ministerial duty to perform according to the laws of the State of California, including the Brown Act.
- Respondent has failed and refused to perform its ministerial duties as required by the Brown Act.
- Petitioner has a clear, present, and legal right to Respondent's performance of its ministerial duties, as required by the Brown Act.
- 43. Respondent has a present legal duty and present ability to perform its ministerial duties set forth in the Brown Act.
- 44. Petitioner has an interest in having the laws executed and public duties enforced and, therefore, has a beneficial interest in the outcome of the proceedings.
- 45. Through this action, Petitioner seeks no greater relief than that which would be afforded to any other member of the public.
 - 46. Petitioner has exhausted all of its administrative remedies.
- 47. Petitioner has sent a Brown Act Demand to Cease and Desist pursuant to 27 Government Code Section 54960.2" ("Demand") to the Board.
- 48. The Board, through its legal counsel, has failed to make an unconditional commitment to cease and desist.
- 49. The only plain, speedy, and adequate remedy left to Petitioner is the relief provided by Government Code Sections 54960 and 54960.1.

WHEREFORE, PETITIONER PRAYS AS FOLLOWS:

- For a declaration that Respondent COUNTY OF MARIN violated the Ralph M.
 Brown Act by discussing the COUNTY compliance with the Housing Element without proper notice in violation of Government Code Sections 54952.2(a) (1) 13 and 54954.2(a) (2);
- 2. To direct that a peremptory writ of mandate issue, ordering Respondent COUNTY OF MARIN to perform as required by the Brown Act, by only discussing and/or taking action on the matters within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction where the item appears on a posted agenda adequately describing subjects to be discussed;
- 3. That the Petitioner/Plaintiff recover attorneys' fees incurred in this action pursuant to Government Code Section 6259 and/or Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
- 4. For an award of costs incurred in this action; and
- 5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated this 15th day of December, 2014

LAW OFFICES OF EDWARD E. YATES

Edward E. Yates
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

(C.C.P. §§ 446 and 2015.5)
Petitioner, Community Ventures Partners

COMMUNITY VENTURES PARTNERS, INC., Petitioner, v. COUNTY OF MARIN, Respondent

I, Bob Silvestri, President of Petitioner COMMUNITY VENTURES PARTNERS, INC., in the above entitled action and proceeding have read the VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE; INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT WITH EXHIBITS A THROUGH I, and know the contents thereof, and I certify that the same is true and correct of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated upon my information and belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

This Verification was executed on <u>December 15, 2014</u> at <u>Larkspul</u>, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

