

Announcement - 9.30 AM –August 7, 2006 - Regular Meeting of the RBOC (Revenue Bond Oversight Committee).

At this meeting the so-called Informational Policy (IP) will be discussed. The informational policy was one of the first and most popular items initiated by the RBOC. I was the only member opposing it. I opposed it on the grounds that it was my belief that it was specifically implemented for one member.

The deal (IP) is that any RBOC member requesting information from the SFPUC must submit their request to the full RBOC (at a scheduled meeting) and if a consensus is established, the information will be presented as a RBOC request to ensure a "uniform front." Without this consensus the SFPUC may choose to ignore any request, from any individual member, as being derivative from the RBOC. The City Attorney's Office has validated this position. I do not believe that this procure is consistent with 2002 Proposition P that I co-authored. I personally perceive this as an unnecessary constraint on independent member research based on the multidisciplinary concept used to create the RBOC (2002 Proposition P).

As a member of the RBOC, via the Sunshine Ordinance, I was able to ascertain that staff employed by the SFPUC and the Controller participated in the vote to select our first independent auditor. I did not participate, even though I am on the audit selection-working group? This staff participation did not make sense to me in the context of the RBOC being an independent oversight committee. I cannot find where this meeting was agendized. The icing on this cake was when I learned that the GM and DGM of the SFPUC saw (via Chair and Vice Chair) the final draft version of the audit report before the full committee was so privileged. This action seems inconsistent with the theory driving a "uniform front" for the so-called informational policy. Are there special exceptions?

2002 Proposition P mandates (Section 5.31E of Proposition P) that the RBOC should be logistically supported ("supplied") by the Board of Supervisors. It is supported ("supplied") by the SFPUC. I find this coziness contrary to both the legislation and spirit of 2002 Proposition P. On a number of occasions, as late as July 3, 2006, I have written to Board of Supervisors President, Honorable Aaron Peskin, about my concerns as to who should "supply" the SFPUC. He has not responded as of writing.

I hope you attend on the 7th.

Brian Browne
First Chair Board of Supervisors - RBOC
www.h2oecon.com