

From: <guerry@screentight.com>
To: "MIKE COUICK" <MNC@SCSENATE.ORG>, <cblack@gov.sc.gov>
Date: 5/11/2005 6:20:04 PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Foreword to CSFB Report Explanation

Keith, Please put this issue to rest. If there is something you can not get from csfb then please explain. This issue deserves full disclosure and needs to be put to bed. If you faxed the material then it seems reasonable that csfb could fax back to you. Please advise asap. Guerry

>
 > From: "MIKE COUICK" <MNC@SCSENATE.ORG>
 > Date: 2005/05/11 Wed PM 04:49:10 CDT
 > To: <cblack@gov.sc.gov>, <guerry@screentight.com>
 > CC: "GLENN McCONNELL" <GFM@SCSENATE.ORG>,
 > "LUKE RANKIN" <LR@SCSENATE.ORG>
 > Subject: Fwd: Foreword to CSFB Report Explanation

> Guerry and Carl:

> This is the response provided by Mr. Munson. Please note that the document itself refers to being the "tweaked" history ? what was the original, how was it labelled, to what use did Mr. Munson as the "default" point of contact ask that the information be used by First Boston. I believe that all of this confirms my need for the copies from First Boston. The cost of forwarding Mr. Munsons emails and other correspondence to First Boston should be minimal.

> Can you help? Mike

> Michael N. Couick
 > Attorney & Director of Research
 > S.C. Senate Judiciary Committee
 > Post Office Box 142
 > Columbia, SC 29202
 > (803) 212-6623
 > mnc@scsenate.org


>>> "Munson, Keith" <KMunson@wcsr.com> 5/11/2005 4:50:55 PM >>>

> Please see Confidentiality Notice before reading email.

> Judge Brogdon: This should clear up any confusion about the source of the history/foreword. I am comfortable with you sharing this with Mike Couick, et al. I apologize for the occasional editorial tone, but as everyone knows, I am strongly opposed to S-573. I am leaving for Miami in about 30 minutes for a case, but will be back in the office on Monday. Please email me with any details about next week's hearings. Thanks.

> KEITH

> Keith D. Munson
 > Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
 > Poinsett Plaza, Suite 700
 > 104 S. Main Street
 > Greenville, South Carolina 29601
 > 864.255.5412 (Direct)
 > 864.255.5480 (Fax)
 > kmunson@wcsr.com



From: "Munson, Keith" <KMunson@wcsr.com>
To: <guerry@screentight.com>, "MIKE COUICK" <MNC@SCSENATE.ORG>, <cblack@gov.sc.gov>
Date: 5/11/2005 9:07:59 PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Foreword to CSFB Report Explanation

Please see Confidentiality Notice before reading email.

Guerry: Unfortunately I have no basis to direct CSFB to provide the requested documentation, if they even have anything more than I already sent you. Typically, they would give a client his documents upon request, but in this case, Santee Cooper has disclaimed the foreword and so that would essentially negate any authority I might have previously had to request copies of whatever they might have. Obviously, I am not personally their client and so cannot personally request them. Santee Cooper may be the client, but they disavowed the foreword, so they cannot ask for something that is admittedly not theirs to be returned. I guess that leaves the foreword as a kind of free lanced essay. I really don't see that any of us are in a position to put any pressure on CSFB to obtain additional documents, if any. I did speak with CSFB and learned that the judiciary committee did talk to one of their representatives and was raising concerns about CSFB printing the Santee Cooper logo on each page of the report without permission. As you can imagine this put them on their guard as to the motivation of the committee and now all requests must be handled by their counsel, which I think would be the policy of any large company. If it would help, I would be glad to sponsor a resolution at the next board meeting to clarify that CSFB had permission to use the logo, if you think that would settle their nerves and make them more reseptive to any of our requests, although I suspect they would need additional assurance, which only the judiciary committee could give them. That is all I can think of. Fortunately, all the information was contained in my earlier letter and that should put the issue to bed. I will be back from Miami in time for the hearings next week and I plan to attend and could answer any additional questions at that time. Keith

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

From: guerry@screentight.com [mailto:guerry@screentight.com]
Sent: Wed May 11 18:19:33 2005
To: MIKE COUICK; cblack@gov.sc.gov
Cc: GLENN McCONNELL; LUKE RANKIN
Subject: Re: Fwd: Foreword to CSFB Report Explanation

Keith, Please put this issue to rest. If there is something you can not get from csfb then please explain. This issue deserves full disclosure and needs to be put to bed. If you faxed the material then it seems reasonable that csfb could fax back to you. Please advise asap. Guerry

>

> From: "MIKE COUICK" <MNC@SCSENATE.ORG>
 > Date: 2005/05/11 Wed PM 04:49:10 CDT
 > To: <cblack@gov.sc.gov>, <guerry@screentight.com>
 > CC: "GLENN McCONNELL" <GFM@SCSENATE.ORG>
 > "LUKE RANKIN" <LR@SCSENATE.ORG>
 > Subject: Fwd: Foreword to CSFB Report Explanation

>

> Guerry and Carl:

>

> This is the response provided by Mr. Munson. Please note that the document itself refers to being the "tweaked" history? what was the original, how was it labelled, to what use did Mr. Munson as the "default" point of contact ask that the information be used by First Boston. I believe that all of this confirms my need for the copies from First Boston. The cost of forwarding Mr. Munsons emails and other correspondence to First Boston should be minimal.

>

> Can you help? Mike

>