

Law Offices of Craig P. Alexander

24681 La Plaza, Suite 250

Dana Point, CA 92629

Office: 949-481-6400 Facsimile: 949-242-2545

E-mail: craig@craigalexanderlaw.com

VIA ELECTRONIC (BRENDA.GEE@UCSF.EDU) AND U.S. MAIL

July 28, 2020

Ms. Brenda Gee
University of California, San Francisco
Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
513 Parnassus Ave., S-115
San Francisco, CA 94143-0400

RE: California Public Records Act Request of Terrisa Bukovinac and Pro-Life San Francisco – CPRA Request No. 019-090

Dear Ms. Gee:

This firm has been retained by Ms. Terrisa Bukovinac and Pro-Life San Francisco.

Enclosed are two items. First is Ms. Bukovinac's letter dated July 3, 2019 to the University which constitutes a Public Records Act request under Government Code section 6250, et seq. The second item is your letter to Ms. Bukovinac dated July 17, 2019 acknowledging she and her organization's CPRA request. Your estimate to when the documents would be disclosed was eight weeks from July 17, 2019.

My clients do not have any record of ever receiving any final response to this request or any responsive documents being delivered to them.

Under Government Code section 6253 (c) your agency had 10 days to respond to my clients' requests. It is allowed another 14 days when the number of records is voluminous. That 24 total day period has expired a long time ago.

Ms. Bukovinac also advises that she followed up with the University via e-mail to you on November 27, 2019. She does not have a record of a response to that inquiry either.

The University is vastly overdue to respond and disclose responsive records to my clients. Please send to this office all responsive documents no later than 10 days from the date of this letter (**Friday, August 7, 2020**).

In your letter of July 17, 2019 you stated that the University will make the records available "upon payment of fees covering direct cost of duplication." However, no

estimate of that cost was ever given to my clients. In addition, my client specifically asked if the cost of duplication was above \$50 that the University let her know this so she could review and decide which records she wished to obtain.

As you know the Government Code allows a requestor to either pay the direct cost for these records or to come and review the records (at no cost) then decide which ones the requestor wishes to obtain. That was not done here. Also, it is now common practice for agencies to forward documents to requestors via e-mail, cloud or thumb drive normally at no cost to the requestor. This is an acknowledgment that the vast majority of documents today are already in digital format.

The Government Code also allows a requestor to ask for the documents in the format they are stored in if they already exist digitally. Government Code section 6253.9 (a) (2) & (e). Therefore we request that the responsive documents be sent to me electronically. Sending them to me via e-mail (craig@craigalexanderlaw.com) is fine. If the amount of documents is too great for e-mail delivery, I am happy to supply the University with a thumb drive it can send back to me via mail. Please let me know.

If we do not receive the University's response by **Friday, August 7, 2020**, my clients will file a Petition for Writ of Mandate with the Superior Court to enforce their rights under the California Public Records Act.

Thank you in advance for your courtesy and cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

//s//

Craig P. Alexander

Enclosure as stated