

From: David Waggoner <davidpwaggoner@gmail.com>
To: Sherri Kaiser <Sherri.Kaiser@sfgov.org>
Cc: Scott Emblidge <emblidge@mesllp.com>, Mardoux Torrise <torrise@mesllp.com>, "John St.Croix" <john.st.croix@sfgov.org>, Mabel Ng <Mabel.Ng@sfgov.org>, Peter Keith <peter.keith@sfgov.org>, Shepard Kopp <shep@shepardkopplaw.com>

Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2012 09:56PM
Subject: Re: Further information about today's hearing

Dear Mr. Emblidge,

Mr. Keith is correct: it was not Paula Canny but attorney Scott Burrell to whom Mr. Keith indicated that the video would be subject to Sunshine requests, and that the City Attorney would honor those requests. Mr. Burrell is the law partner of Lidia Stiglich. I apologize for the inadvertent error. The import is the same; the City Attorney confirmed it will release the video to anyone who asks for it. If that is not true, I hope Mr. Keith will clarify to whom, other than the Ethics Commission, the City Attorney intends to release the video.

Best Regards,
David Waggoner

On May 15, 2012, at 7:14 PM, Sherri Kaiser <Sherri.Kaiser@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Emblidge,

I argued the motion today before Judge Wong. The Judge orally denied Ms. Lopez's request for a protective order.

I reviewed the submission by Mr. Waggoner and noted he made the following statement: "Deputy City Attorney Peter Keith informed counsel for Ms. Lopez, Paula Canny, that the City Attorney would release the video to any member of the public who asked for it." That statement is incorrect. I never said or wrote that to Ms. Canny. Ms. Canny rushed out of the hearing immediately after the Court's oral rulings. My only communication with Ms. Canny about our office's intentions concerning release of the video was the email that Ms. Kaiser already forwarded to you regarding the immediate disclosure request under the Sunshine Ordinance.

Sincerely,
Peter Keith