GOPY

1 Karl Olson (SBN 104760)
kolson@ramolson.com
RAM & OLSON LLP
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: 415-433-4949
Fax: 415-433-7311

Attorneys for Petitioner

ν.

RETIREMENT SYSTEM.

ENDORSED Superior Court of California County of San Francisco

JUL 1 8 2010

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: WESLEY BANIFES THE COURT

6

5

7

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

to find out why.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO** 

FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION,

Petitioner,

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES'

Respondent.

No.

10-51052

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT (Government Code sections 6258 and 6259)

Date: august 31, 2010 Time: 9130 a.m.

Place: 12950 302

1. This Petition for Writ of Mandate under the California Public Records Act ("PRA"), seeks records related to the California Public Employee Retirement System's (hereafter CalPERS') disastrous investment in Page Mill Properties II. At a time when CalPERS is under close scrutiny because of inflated payments to "placement agents" who steered CalPERS' money to disastrous investments, CalPERS has taken the position that it will not disclose records related to this investment. CalPERS' position is in direct defiance of article I, section 3(b) of the California Constitution, which opens records to public scrutiny. This Petition seeks to shed light on how CalPERS lost \$100 million in a socially-irresponsible investment. Socially-responsible investors aim to do well and do good. CalPERS did very poorly and did bad. This Petition aims

## FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2. Petitioner First Amendment Coalition (hereafter FAC") is a section 501(c)(3) non-profit organization headquartered in San Rafael, California dedicated to safeguarding access to

information for the public and to free speech and free press rights. On January 13, 2010, FAC's executive director, Peter Scheer, write a Public Records Act request to CalPERS' general counsel, Peter Mixon, requesting the Private Placement Memorandum and Partnership Agreement in connection with CalPERS' investment in an East Palo Alto apartment complex, Page Mill Properties II. A copy of Mr. Scheer's request is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

- 3. On January 27, 2010, CalPERS denied the request in a letter from its staff counsel, Javier Plasencia, who took the position that the documents requested were exempt on various grounds. A copy of Mr. Plasencia's response is attached as Exhibit B.
- 4. On February 24, 2010, petitioner's counsel, Karl Olson, wrote a letter to Mr. Plasencia which (a) requested that CalPERS reconsider its position on FAC's first request, and (b) supplemented First Amendment Coalition's request by requesting additional public record from CalPERS related to the Page Mill Properties investment. A copy of Mr. Olson's February 24, 2010 letter is attached hereto as Exhibit C.
- 5. On March 4, 2010, Mr. Plasencia wrote to Mr. Olson, stating that, "The appropriate real estate program staff is currently reviewing your request to determine which documents we have and are subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act. We estimate that this review will be completed in approximately two weeks" (i.e., by March 18). A copy of Mr. Plasencia's March 4 letter is attached hereto as Exhibit D.
- 6. Thereafter, petitioner's counsel called Mr. Plasencia in late March, to see what was happening with the Public Records Act request. Mr. Plasencia assured Mr. Olson that records would shortly be produced. When Mr. Plasencia did not comply with this deadline, Mr. Olson called Mr. Plasencia again on April 5, 2010, warning that petitioner might soon file a lawsuit: "we're not going to wait forever and we're not going away." Another call to Mr. Plasencia later in April was not returned. On May 12, 2010, petitioner's counsel wrote to CalPERS again, reiterating the request that records be produced. A copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit E. On May 20, 2010, CalPERS wrote to petitioner's counsel, producing a few documents but reiterating CalPERS' refusal to produce the private placement memorandum, other business records provided to CalPERS by the general partner, real estate valuations of the

10-

properties, and documents related to CalPERS' decision to invest. (See Exhibit H hereto.)

Finally, on July 9, 2010, Mr. Plasencia – nearly <u>five months</u> after the February 24, 2010 request – wrote Mr. Olson, "As you are aware, I still owe you additional documents, per your request," but said he was going out of the country and would not be able to "finalize" his response until he returned in two weeks. This response utterly failed to comply with Government Code section 6253(c) which, even in "unusual circumstances," requires public agencies to respond to Public Records Act requests within 24 days. (A copy of the July 9, 2010 e-mail is attached as Exhibit I.)

- 7. CalPERS' investment in Page Mill Properties II has been the subject of great public interest and controversy. On February 23, 2010, the *Wall Street Journal* reported, "CalPERS took a hit last year when its investment in Manhattan's Peter Cooper Village and Stuyvesant Town apartment complex collapsed. But Stuyvesant Town wasn't the huge pension fund's only foray into real-estate investments that involved ousting low-rent tenants." The Journal reported that CalPERS invested \$100 million in the Page Mill Properties II project in East Palo Alto in 2006, and that CalPERS had partnered with firms that have bought and converted rent-regulated properties not just in East Palo Alto but also in New York City neighborhoods, including Harlem and Manhattan's Upper East Side. A copy of the *Wall Street Journal's* article is attached hereto as Exhibit F.
- 8. Page Mill Properties isn't CalPERS' only ill-fated foray into real estate. CalPERS invested \$1.12 billion in the new community of Mountain House in San Joaquin County. That investment is now worth \$200 million a loss of \$920 million (see article attached hereto as Exhibit G).

## REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

9. This Petition is brought under the California Public Records Act, Government Code section 6258 and 6259, which is the enforcement mechanism of the California Public Records Act. Petitioner has no plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law to secure release of the records sought, other than this Petition.

## VERIFICATION

I, Peter E. Scheer, am the executive director of the First Amendment Coalition, petitioner in this action. I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Mandate under the Public Records Act. The matters stated therein are true and correct, except as to matters stated on information and belief and as to them I believe them to be true. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Rafael, California on July \_\_\_\_\_, 2010. Peter E. Scheer 

Case No. — PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT (Government Code sections 6258 and 6259)

## **VERIFICATION**

I, Peter E. Scheer, am the executive director of the First Amendment Coalition, petitioner in this action. I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Mandate under the Public Records Act. The matters stated therein are true and correct, except as to matters stated on information and belief and as to them I believe them to be true.

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

Executed in San Rafael, California on July 7th, 2010.

Peter E. Scheer

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_ -- PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT (Government Code sections 6258 and 6259)

)