

**Subject:** RE: Offer to Withdraw SOTF 20007 / Violation Ruling in SOTF 19108  
**Date:** Friday, February 7, 2020 at 4:30:54 PM Pacific Standard Time  
**From:** Coolbrith, Elizabeth (CAT) on behalf of CityAttorney <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
**To:** 'Anonymous' <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>, CityAttorney <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
**CC:** Cote, John (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>  
**Attachments:** image001.jpg, image003.jpg, image004.jpg

Yes, we will include the general statement of issues as well. Both will be part of our prop G calendar process going forward.

Thanks,



**Elizabeth A. Coolbrith**

Paralegal

Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

(415) 554-4685 Direct

[www.sfcityattorney.org](http://www.sfcityattorney.org)

Find us on: [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#)

**From:** Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 6, 2020 4:25 PM  
**To:** CityAttorney <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
**Cc:** Cote, John (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Offer to Withdraw SOTF 20007 / Violation Ruling in SOTF 19108

What about the "(for meetings not otherwise publicly recorded) the general statement of issues discussed" part?

And is this a binding commitment on behalf of Mr. Herrera?

**NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.**

Sincerely,

Anonymous

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

On Thursday, February 6, 2020 4:22 PM, CityAttorney <[cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG](mailto:cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG)> wrote:

Thank you for your message. We have appreciated the SOTF's feedback and will be making it our practice to include the locations in each prop g calendar entry going forward.

Thanks,



**Elizabeth A. Coolbrith**

Paralegal

Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

(415) 554-4685 Direct

[www.sfcityattorney.org](http://www.sfcityattorney.org)

Find us on: [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#)

**From:** Anonymous <[arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com](mailto:arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 11:57 PM

**To:** CityAttorney <[cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG](mailto:cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG)>; Cote, John (CAT) <[John.Cote@sfcityatty.org](mailto:John.Cote@sfcityatty.org)>

**Subject:** Offer to Withdraw SOTF 20007 / Violation Ruling in SOTF 19108

City Attorney Dennis Herrera,

As Mr. Cote knows, SOTF found tonight (in SOTF 19108) the City Attorney himself (but not Elizabeth Coolbrith nor the Office of the City Attorney as an agency) violated SFAC 67.29-5 for not recording in the Prop G calendar the places and (for meetings not otherwise publicly recorded) the general statement of issues discussed. (As was noted by various SOTF members during the hearing: a general 'City Hall' note would not be sufficient, nor is answering questions after-the-fact about meetings because it does not serve the historical purpose of **recording** this information in the Prop G Calendar.)

I am willing to withdraw the similar SOTF 20007 (Prop G calendar violations proven over a much longer time period) IF:

- your most recent Prop G calendars starting with Feb 6 comply completely with the 67.29-5 requirements (which I will verify starting 3 business days after Feb 6, 2020),
- I get the signed SOTF Order 19108 in hand, and
- Mr. Herrera specifically agrees in a signed letter (or signed by his representative and under Herrera's name) to comply with SFAC 67.29-5 and to waive any kind of challenge to SOTF Order 19108.

If you are amenable to the above, please let me know. I don't need two hearings and two sets of violations if you are willing to comply, without caveats or word-games, with this one. I'm sure SOTF will monitor your compliance whenever 19108 circles back to Compliance committee.

SFAC 67.29-5 appears to be an extremely simple requirement that almost every other agency head does correctly (including with names or numbers of their City Hall rooms), and that you advise the rest of the City to do in your Good Govt Guide (which, even when it supports my position, has no legal authority), and I hope you can simply comply exactly as stated.

***NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.***

Sincerely,

Anonymous