



2010 CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

AGENDA

Wednesday, March 10, 2010 at 5:30 p.m.

Cunha Intermediate School Kelly Avenue and Church Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Directions to Campus: <http://www.cabrillo.k12.ca.us/cunha/directscunha.htm>

Map of campus: <http://www.cabrillo.k12.ca.us/cunha/file/Campus.pdf>

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Setting of the Agenda
3. Oral Communications and Public Comment
(If your subject is not on the agenda, the Chair will recognize you at this time. Speakers are customarily limited to three minutes, subject to the discretion of the Chair based on the number of agenda items to be considered and the number of speakers. A speaker's slip is required.)
4. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of February 23, 2010
5. Further Discussion of Charter provision 203 relating to filling vacancies on the Board of Supervisors (Subtopics: (1) Process for Filling Vacancies; (2) Rules and Restrictions on Appointees) **(Direction may be given to staff but no final action will be taken with regard to this topic.)**
6. Discussion regarding the role of the Board of Supervisors in overseeing County's investment policies and other subject areas for further consideration for potential Charter amendments.
7. Discussion regarding additional data requests for staff for future meetings
8. Written Communications Received by the Charter Review Committee
9. Adjourn

A copy of the 2010 Charter Review Committee agenda packet is available for review at the office of the County Counsel, 400 County Center, 6th Floor, Monday through Friday 8 a.m.- 5 p.m and at <http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/CharterReviewCommittee>. Written materials may be presented to the Committee electronically by sending them to [Charter Review@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:CharterReview@co.sanmateo.ca.us).

Meetings are accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals who need special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Shirley Lectura, Legal Executive Assistant at least 2 working days before the meeting at (650) 363-4684 and/or slectura@co.sanmateo.ca.us. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and the materials related to it. Attendees to this meeting are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products.



2010 CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

MINUTES

Tuesday, February 23, 2010 at 5:30 p.m.
455 County Center, Room 101, Redwood City, California 94063

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

- 1.) Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting was called to order by Chair Foote.

All members present except Kessler, Nagler and Brissenden-Smith.

- 2.) Setting of the Agenda

No action taken.

- 3.) Oral Communications and Public Comment

Speakers:

Michael Stogner, San Carlos, who spoke for elections to fill Board of Supervisors vacancies, spoke about the process used to fill Supervisor Hill's seat, and noted that the members of the Board of Supervisors should acknowledge that they are members of the Service League.

- 4.) Approval of Minutes of Meeting of February 10, 2010

Motion to approve by Foust, second by Noparstak, with the following amendments:

- **Correct spelling of "Faust" to "Foust" through the minutes.**
- **Correction to Item 8 (b)**

"4. Using FPPC Fair Political Practices Commission reporting-cost of candidate campaigns (contested and uncontested) for County office as compared to candidate campaigns(contested and uncontested) for City Council in Daly City."

“5. Is Are the data referred to in the 1978 and 1980 charter amendment measure campaigns still valid today?”

- **Correction to Item 8 (d)**

“3. Can the Charter provide for a cumulative voting process to elect is its county officers?”

- **Correction to Item 8 (e)**

“1. Information regarding the requirement for the State of ~~Texas~~ Texas to periodically review its Boards and Commissions.”

Vote: abstention by Miller, Pine, Schulte, unanimous approval by remainder of Committee.

- 5.) Discussion and Approval of Schedule for Future Meetings

Discussion of meeting schedule. Confirmation that all meetings will commence at 5:30 p.m.

- 6.) Presentation by Warren Slocum, Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder of election related data requested by the Charter Review Committee and discussion of election related data

Speaker: Warren Slocum, Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder, spoke about voting trends and costs associated with all mail ballot, permanent absentees and poll voting, noting that all mail ballots elections are cheaper, have a higher turnout, and are safe. He generally referred to the data compiled by the Elections Office. Mr. Slocum then responded to questions posed by Committee members.

- 7.) Discussion of Charter provision 203 relating to filling vacancies on the Board of Supervisors Subtopics: (1) Process for Filling Vacancies; (2) Rules and Restrictions on Appointees)

(Committee member Burrow left meeting at 6:25 p.m.)

Speakers:

Therese M. Dyer, Pacifica, spoke for elections and for all mail ballot elections, officials who leave office early for another office should pay part of the costs of the election to fill vacancy, there should be discipline for certain elected county officials.

Sabrina Brennan, Moss Beach, spoke for elections, risk of discrimination if an appointment process is used rather than election.

Michael Stogner, San Carlos, spoke for elections, problems with the appointment process to fill Sup. Hill’s vacancy, that it is hard to run countywide because of the cost.

Bernie Sifry, Pacifica, spoke for elections, democracy has its price and we should not be afraid of it, appointees get experience but incumbents get elected and non-incumbents do not, should look at how the vacancy in Sen. Kennedy's office was filled.

Actions taken: Committee requested staff to try an obtain the following additional information and data:

- 1. The process used when appointments are made by the Governor to fill a vacancy on the Board of Supervisors.**
 - 2. The ability to charge a former official with the costs of filling the vacant seat if the vacancy was caused by the official taking another elected office.**
 - 3. For any County election, the ability to mandate the Board of Supervisors' use of all mail ballots in the event that all mail ballots are authorized by state law in the future.**
 - 4. Additional demographic data presented by District.**
 - 5. Information related to a recommendation by a previous Charter Review Committee to amend the Charter provision regarding filling of vacancies.**
- 8.) Discussion regarding subject areas for further consideration for potential Charter Amendment

Member Pine requested that the Committee agendaize a discussion on the role of the Board of Supervisors in overseeing County's investment policies.

Chair Foote stated that it would be added to the end of next meeting's agenda.

- 9.) Discussion regarding additional data requests for staff for future meetings. There was a recap of the data requested under Item 7:
- 10.) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To: Honorable Members, 2010 Charter Review Committee
From: Michael P. Murphy, County Counsel *MPM*
Subject: Further Discussion of Charter Provision 203 Relating to Filling of Vacancies on the Board of Supervisors (Agenda Item 5, Meeting of 3/10/2010)
Date: March 10, 2010

Attached are materials to assist in the further consideration of this agenda item:

- 1) E-mail from the Chair regarding documents to assist in consideration of the item.
- 2) Outline of options for appointment v. election.
- 3) Calendar or regularly scheduled election dates.

Att.

cc: David Boesch, County Manager
Mary McMillan, Deputy County Manager

MPM:sl

From: "Sean Foote" <sfoote@alethion.com>
To: "Mike Murphy" <mmurphy@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
CC: "Brenda Carlson" <bcarlson@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 2/26/2010 2:32 PM
Subject: text for sending decision tree
Attachments: election calendar.doc; appointment decision tree; Part.003

Here is some text to send along to the committee along with the decision tree.

Committee Members,

Attached is a document which outlines the options for Appointment versus Election. It's good to spend some time before the next meeting thinking about the various options within this decision tree.

This layout is not perfect, however. If you see things that are confusing or if some ideas you have are not covered, please let Staff know and we'll make revisions.

Also attached is a calendar of regularly scheduled and "special" election dates. It's an aid to understanding the complex permutations of calling elections. Depending on the length of time given to the Board to decide and hold elections, then you can pick a vacancy month and count forward to the month (or range of months) when the election must occur. Confusing? Yep.

Sean

This is not intended to be legal language, but a grouping of the variables for us to decide. Bracketed language is optional.

=====

In the event of vacancy, the Board of Supervisors within [60 days / xx days] of notice of the vacancy . . .

1. [Will /may] declare an election to fill the vacancy
 - a. When the vacancy occurs in the time period of
 - i. No time period – the election is always held
 - ii. Other than the last [6 months / 1 year] of the term
 - b. The election must be held
 - i. Within [88 day filing deadline + 2 weeks] and [88 day filing deadline + 2 months]
 - ii. Coincident with a general election
 1. Only if the general election is within the required time period
 2. Even if the general election is beyond the required time period by [xx months]
 - c. The election [will/may] be conducted
 - i. In accordance with state election statute
 - ii. through all mail-in balloting if a special election
 - iii. [on “established election” dates (to cost share) / on any date so chosen (for flexibility, but no cost sharing possible)]
2. [Will /may] appoint someone to fill the vacancy
 - a. When the vacancy occurs in the time period of
 - i. In the last [6 months / 1 year] of a term
 - ii. In the range of x months before a general election
 - b. For the duration of
 - i. The remainder of the term
 - ii. Until the election to fill the vacancy
 - c. Appointment will be made by
 - i. Unanimous vote of the remaining board
 - ii. Majority vote of the remaining board (recognizing that with 4 remaining supervisors this is a 3 to 1 vote requirement or 75%)
 - d. If appointment is not made in this time, then

- i. An election will be held (if not already required above)
 - ii. The seat remains vacant until the election
 - iii. The Governor decides
 - e. The appointee [can/cannot] run for the seat in that election
 - f. If there is more than one vacancy simultaneously
 - i. Appointment is [permitted / required]
- 3. [Will /may] leave the seat vacant until the next election
 - a. When the vacancy occurs in the time period of
 - i. In the last [6 months / 1 year] of a term
 - ii. In the range of x months before the election

This is a tool for thinking about the timing of elections to fill vacancies. Depending on how long it takes to call order and election, notice, file, and campaign and conduct an election (let's say 4 months), then one can test scenarios. It's important to give flexibility for those scenarios.

DISTRICTS 1,4,5

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
First			X			X					X	
Second				X		County Primary					General	
		Election cycle for Districts 2 and 3										
Third			X			X					X	
Fourth		<i>US Pres Primary</i>	X	X		County Primary X					General	
		Election cycle for Districts 1, 4 and 5										

X = months that are “available” for elections (so called “established election dates”), but for which none are typically scheduled. The charter can specify explicitly that elections can be held on other dates. Mail ballot elections cannot be combined with poll elections and thus must be held on a separate date.



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To: Honorable Members, 2010 Charter Review Committee
From: Michael P. Murphy, County Counsel *MPM*
Subject: Response to Information Requests from Meeting of February 23, 2010
(Agenda Item 8, Meeting of 3/10/2010)
Date: March 10, 2010

The Committee made several information requests at the meeting of February 23rd. Attached are responses to those requests:

1. The process used when appointments are made by the Governor to fill a vacancy on the Board of Supervisors.

We have sent out an enquiry to other counties which provide for the filling of vacancies through appointment by the Governor. Not surprisingly, there have been relatively few instances where the process was triggered. A recent example is Monterey County, which experienced a board vacancy in 2008, which was filled by the Governor. We have made contact with the County of Monterey and hope to have a response prior to next Wednesday's meeting.

2. The ability to charge a former official with the costs of filling the vacant seat if the vacancy was caused by the official taking another elected office.

We have found no authority in state law to allow a person to be charged the costs of filling a vacant seat in the event of a decision by a County elected official to seek another office. We note that such a requirement would likely be analyzed under constitutional and statutory authority relating to qualifications to run for elected office, and could be considered as an unconstitutional barrier to candidacy for the second office. In this regard, it is noteworthy that State law specifies the events which cause an office to become vacant (including resignation from office) without specifying any penalty for vacating office. We also note that there is a well-developed body of law on the doctrine of "incompatible offices" which generally holds that a person assuming a second elected office that is incompatible with one already held automatically vacates the first office; again without any indication that a penalty should attach because the first term is not completed.

In addition to the questionable legal basis for imposing such a requirement, there are a number of policy considerations which, in themselves, may trigger legal issues. First is the question of whether a person who vacates an office because he or she is elected to another office should be treated differently than a person who resigns for some other reason; if the answer is that there should be no distinction, the question then arises as to who would make the decision as to whether a decision to resign is truly voluntary, or caused by circumstances beyond the person's control (e.g., an official who resigns for health reasons

or to take care of ailing relatives). Additionally, there are competing public policies as to whether or not seeking another office should be discouraged by the imposing of a substantial monetary penalty; while there is clearly a good public policy reason for encouraging an elected official to complete the term of office for which he or she was elected, there is a competing public policy which encourages an able official to run for higher office, where he or she may be in a position to better serve his or her constituency. For example, President Obama ran for, and was elected to, the presidency during his term as a Senator, thus vacating his seat and causing the state of Illinois to incur substantial expense in filling the vacancy.

3. For any County election, the ability to mandate the Board of Supervisors' use of all-mail ballots in the event that all-mail ballots are authorized by state law in the future.

The legal answer to the question as to whether the Board may mandate all-mail ballots in the event state law authorizes all-mail ballots in the future may well depend on how any such legislation is framed. If legislation were to be written in a way that explicitly makes the Board of Supervisors the body which decides whether or not to use an all-mail ballot system (as opposed to "the County" generally), there would be a strong argument that the electorate, through a Charter amendment, could not interfere with the Board's exercise of that discretion.

From a practical standpoint, mandating the use of all-mail ballots might, in some circumstances, preclude taking advantage of the economies of a consolidated election, where election costs are split among the various agencies with matters on the ballot. Currently, Board members are regularly elected at primary or general statewide elections which afford the County the advantage of sharing election costs with other agencies. An all-mail ballot would have to be conducted separately, and consolidation with elections held by other agencies would not be possible. Additionally, an all-mail ballot election might add additional cost due to the additional strain on the County elections office, which would be required to conduct not only the conventional election on behalf of other County agencies, but an all-mail election for Board members at the same time. Making all-mail balloting an option instead of a mandate would give the Board the flexibility to determine which approach is more economical given the particular circumstances and timing of an election.

4. Additional demographic data presented by District.

We have collected data from the 2000 census, which is available on the website maintained by the City/County Association of Governments, and developed an approximation of the demographic data for each of the current supervisorial districts. This information is provided in two charts, which are attached. The first breaks down district population by race and ethnic origin, the other provides median household income by each of the cities in the district. As indicated in the notes to the charts, the accuracy of the data is affected by the fact that the census data is ten years old, by the fact that supervisorial district lines do not follow city boundaries in many cases, and by the fact that data is not available for much

of the unincorporated area. Further, the numbers provided in these charts should not be compared against the charts provided with the materials for the February 23rd meeting, as the charts presented here reflect certain adjustments made to avoid data from a city which straddles two districts from being represented twice. For these reasons, these charts, which show general demographic characteristics of the five districts, should be used to help foster discussions, rather than taken as a precise current actual demographic snapshot of the districts.

We have additionally included a chart which indicates the voting turnout by district for gubernatorial primary and general elections, and presidential primary and general elections from the year 2002 through 2008. Additionally, the data is broken down by mail and poll voting, which shows not only the present incidence of mail voting, but also the upward trend of such voting over the years. These particular elections were chosen as elections for which turnout would be higher, and aberrations caused by issues of specific interest in a single district would be minimized.

5. Information related to a recommendation by a previous Charter Review Committee to amend the Charter provision regarding filling of vacancies.

We have researched the record pertaining to the last Charter review committee, convened in 2002. We have determined that the committee did adopt, and recommend to the Board of Supervisors, an amendment to section 203 of the Charter which would have provided that any vacancy on the Board filled by appointment be only for a term to expire when a successor was elected at the next general election. Set forth below is the text of the language that would have been added to section 203 had the amendment been adopted:

“A person appointed to fill a vacancy shall hold office only until the next regularly scheduled election for county supervisor which is at least 102 days from the effective date of the appointment whereupon an election shall be held to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the unexpired term. A person elected at an election to fill the vacancy shall hold office for the remainder of the term in which the vacancy occurs.”

We have reviewed tapes of the Board charter review amendment proceedings, and provide this summary of the discussions pertaining to section 201: At the February 23, 2003 hearing Adrienne Tissier (at the time the Chair of the Charter Review Committee) presented the eight recommendations of the Charter Review Committee. Her brief description of the Section 203 recommendation included a comment that the committee felt the provision as revised wouldn't give any one person an undue advantage in any type of vacancy that would be filled. There was no further discussion of this issue. A subcommittee was appointed to review the recommendations and report back to the Board in June, 2003 to allow time to get the proposed amendments on the November ballot. On July 15, 2003, the subcommittee (Supervisors Nevin and Church) presented their recommendations to the Board and did not include the revision of Section 203. The only speaker on this matter was a representative of the League of Women Voters who urged the Board to reconsider the revision to Section 203 and place it before the voters. Supervisor

Honorable Members, 2010 Charter Review Committee
March 10, 2010
Page 4

Nevin commented that the proposal had been considered but not accepted - he also commented that he felt a new person should be given as much time as possible (up to the remainder of the term) to prove themselves. Supervisor Gordon discussed the proposed revision to Section 203 and said he felt it was important to retain choices and flexibility rather than being restricted by a mandate in the charter.

Att.

cc: David Boesch, County Manager
Mary McMillan, Deputy County Manager

MPM\sl

L:\CLIENT\BOARDSUP\2010 Charter Review\Memo Comm Re Data For Item 8 031010 Amend.Doc

San Mateo County Demographics Information by District (2000 Census Data) ¹

District	Total	White	Hispanic or Latino	Black or African American	American Indian	Asian	Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	Other Race
District 1	129,226	70,176 (54.3%)	25,252 (19.5%)	2,093 (1.6%)	280 (0.2%)	28,956 (22.4%)	1,960 (1.5%)	509 (0.4%)
District 2	141,466	86,046 (60.8%)	22,594 (15.9%)	3,257 (2.3%)	308 (0.2%)	26,993 (19.1%)	1,762 (1.2%)	506 (0.4%)
District 3	109,376	83,397 (76.2%)	12,746 (11.7%)	2042 (1.9%)	257 (0.2%)	10,230 (9.4%)	438 (0.4%)	266 (0.2%)
District 4	147,833	66,613 (45.1%)	56,447 (38.2%)	10,818 (7.3%)	328 (0.2%)	9,847 (6.7%)	3,440 (2.3%)	340 (0.2%)
District 5	137,098	31,877 (23.3%)	34,515 (25.2%)	5,407 (3.9%)	324 (0.2%)	62,989 (45.9%)	1,417 (1.0%)	569 (0.4%)

Note

1. The above information was compiled from 2000 census data information available on the City/County Association of Governments' website. This information was originally organized by city. Because district lines do not in all cases follow jurisdictional limits, the demographic information presented is approximate only. Further, data was not available for a large portion of the unincorporated area. Thus, for example, the total population shown for District 3 is particularly low, and as a result, in the case of District 3, demographic information presented may vary more from the actual demographic composition of that district than is the case for other districts.

San Mateo County Median Household Income by District (2000 Census Data) ¹

District 1		District 2		District 3		District 4		District 5	
Burlingame	\$68,529.00	Belmont	\$80,905.00	Atherton	\$200,000.00	East Palo Alto	\$45,006.00	Brisbane	\$63,684.00
Highlands/ Baywood Park	\$105,165.00	Foster City	\$95,279.00	El Granada	\$91,979.00	Menlo Park	\$84,609.00	Broadmoor Village	\$69,836.00
Hillsborough	\$193,157.00	San Mateo	\$64,757.00	Emerald Lake Hills	\$127,250.00	North Fair Oaks	\$55,603.00	Colma	\$58,750.00
Millbrae	\$68,404.00			Half Moon Bay	\$78,473.00	Redwood City	\$66,748.00	Daly City	\$62,310.00
San Bruno	\$62,081.00			Montara	\$95,326.00			South SF (west of El Camino)	\$61,764.00
South SF (east of El Camino)	\$61,764.00			Moss Beach	\$91,992.00				
				Pacifica	\$71,737.00				
				Portola Valley	\$158,217.00				
				San Carlos	\$88,460.00				
				West Menlo Park	\$125,881.00				
				Woodside	\$171,126.00				

1. The above information was compiled from 2000 census data information available on the City/County Association of Governments' website. Cities were assigned to a particular district if the greater part of that city is located within the specified district. In the case of South San Francisco, the data is listed under both District 1 and District 5 since the city is fairly evenly split, geographically, between these two districts. Data was not available for substantial parts of the unincorporated area.

	Mail	Mail %	Polls	Polls %	Total
2002 Gubernatorial Primary					
District 1	9,184	35.50%	16686	64.50%	25,870
District 2	9,208	35.08%	17041	64.92%	26,249
District 3	11,055	33.42%	22020	66.58%	33,075
District 4	6,560	31.96%	13966	68.04%	20,526
District 5	6,148	37.49%	10253	62.51%	16,401
2002 Gubernatorial General					
District 1	12,331	33.70%	24262	66.30%	36,593
District 2	12,632	32.39%	26364	67.61%	38,996
District 3	16,255	32.10%	34376	67.90%	50,631
District 4	8,857	29.35%	21323	70.65%	30,180
District 5	8,430	33.97%	16384	66.03%	24,814
2004 Presidential Primary					
District 1	13,366	40.98%	19246	59.02%	32,612
District 2	14,182	40.29%	21015	59.71%	35,197
District 3	18,452	40.44%	27177	59.56%	45,629
District 4	9,989	37.40%	16722	62.60%	26,711
District 5	8,830	42.27%	12060	57.73%	20,890
2004 Presidential General					
District 1	23,728	41.15%	33929	58.85%	57,657
District 2	25,461	41.13%	36448	58.87%	61,909
District 3	33,054	43.30%	43291	56.70%	76,345
District 4	19,083	39.25%	29534	60.75%	48,617
District 5	16,627	38.67%	26374	61.33%	43,001
2006 Gubernatorial Primary					
District 1	14,560	56.89%	11035	43.11%	25,595
District 2	15,237	57.59%	11223	42.41%	26,460
District 3	20,002	57.01%	15081	42.99%	35,083
District 4	10,659	53.95%	9100	46.05%	19,759
District 5	10,307	53.55%	8939	46.45%	19,246
2006 Gubernatorial General					
District 1	20,360	50.61%	19869	49.39%	40,229
District 2	21,531	50.28%	21294	49.72%	42,825
District 3	28,328	49.47%	28930	50.53%	57,258
District 4	15,235	45.89%	17967	54.11%	33,202
District 5	13,786	47.26%	15386	52.74%	29,172
2008 Presidential Primary					
District 1	24,293	57.15%	18217	42.85%	42,510
District 2	24,749	55.06%	20204	44.94%	44,953
District 3	32,013	56.83%	24322	43.17%	56,335
District 4	17,867	52.48%	16178	47.52%	34,045
District 5	15,287	51.69%	14288	48.31%	29,575
2008 Direct Primary					
District 1	16,494	72.80%	6164	27.20%	22,658
District 2	15,540	70.99%	6349	29.01%	21,889
District 3	20,203	68.71%	9201	31.29%	29,404
District 4	10,106	70.75%	4178	29.25%	14,284
District 5	10,087	71.49%	4023	28.51%	14,110
2008 Presidential General					
District 1	32,728	56.02%	25689	43.98%	58,417
District 2	32,949	54.08%	27975	45.92%	60,924
District 3	41,165	55.05%	33619	44.95%	74,784
District 4	24,014	51.23%	22863	48.77%	46,877
District 5	22,186	49.52%	22615	50.48%	44,801

CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE
County of San Mateo

March 10, 2010

Agenda Item 8

To: Charter Review Committee

From: Michael P. Murphy, County Counsel

Subject: Written communications received by the Charter Review Committee

A. List of written communications received from the public since last meeting:

1. February 26, 2010 e-mail from Sabrina Brennan (attached)
2. March 3, 2010 e-mail from Rene White (attached)

From: "sabrina brennan" <sabrina@dfm.com>
To: <CharterReview@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 2/26/2010 9:18 PM
Subject: CRC meeting video

Thanks for uploading the CRC meeting video to the San Mateo County website.

Please post the embedded link to the CRC meeting video on the County website so the video can be netcast on local new sites.

Thank you,
sabrina brennan

From: "Rene White" <rwhite@lizmar.com>
To: <CharterReview@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 3/3/2010 4:16 PM
Subject: Great resource

Thanks for making the meeting of 2/23/2010 available on video. Sean Foote did a terrific job of moderating and keeping the discussion on track. I'm looking forward to following the committee's progress throughout the coming months.

Rene White
Chair, Farm Hill Neighborhood Association
rwhite@lizmar.com