



Maricela E. Marroquin

T 213.626.8484
F 213.626.0078
E mmarroquin@rwglaw.com

355 South Grand Avenue
40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101
rwglaw.com

September 27, 2019

Martin Truitt
martin117a@gmail.com

Re: Public Records Act Requests #11448 and 11586

Dear Mr. Truitt:

As you are aware, the City of Pasadena ("City") has retained our firm to respond to some Public Records Act requests. PRA 11448, category 5 requested that the City produce "Copies of all material generated by any member of the cannabis selection/interview committee relating to the selection/interview/application process." The scoring sheets can be found on the City's Marijuana Regulations website here: <https://ww5.cityofpasadena.net/planning/redacted-cannabis-applications/>. You can find the scoring sheets on the first 4 pages of each application. Enclosed here: <https://app.box.com/s/Owtdx21quljqce66h3hsqc4cj3ahtnrv> are the scoring sheets for the cannabis retailer permit applicants whose applications have not yet been redacted and uploaded on to the City's website. Additionally, enclosed in the link above are the contracts between the City and HdL that had not yet been produced to you in response to PRA 11586.

The Public Records Act permits a local agency to withhold from disclosure records that are exempt from disclosure, or portions of such records that are covered by an exemption. (Cal. Gov. Code, § 6250 et seq.) For this production, the City is withholding records from disclosure, in part, pursuant to one or a combination of the exemptions listed below:

- A. Statements of personal worth or personal financial data required by a licensing agency and filed by an applicant with the licensing agency to establish his or her personal qualification for the license, certificate, or permit applied for. (Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(n)).
- B. The records contain information that is exempt from disclosure under California Government Code section 6255, as the public interest served in not disclosing the information clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure, including the deliberative process privilege, as set forth in *Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court* (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1325; *Rogers v.*

Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 469; *California First Amendment Coalition v. Superior Court* (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 159.

As previously communicated to you, the City anticipates providing to you the remainder of the HdL-related documents responsive to this request and responsive to PRA 11586 on or about September 30, 2019.

Additionally, you have requested that the City provide you with a time frame of when you can expect to receive the remainder of the Richard McDonald emails and the Guille Nunez emails for PRA 11448. The City anticipates producing the Richard McDonald emails to you on or about October 4, 2019. Given the volume of documents, the remainder of these documents may be produced in multiple productions, with all the Richard McDonald emails being produced to you on or about October 11, 2019. The City anticipates that it will begin producing to you the Guille Nunez emails on or about October 25, 2019. If the City can provide the documents to you sooner than the deadlines identified above, it will do so.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Maricela E. Marroquin', written in a cursive style.

Maricela E. Marroquin

11131-0081\2341182v1.doc