

Member, Board of Supervisors  
District 3



City and County of San Francisco

AARON PESKIN

November 16, 2016

Professor Jack P. Moehle  
Civil and Environmental Engineering  
University of California Berkeley  
775 Davis Hall, Berkeley CA

Dear Prof. Moehle:

Thank you for your initial willingness to participate in tomorrow's hearing at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee. As you know, the details of the review and approval process of both the 80 Natoma and 301 Mission projects have profound implications not only for the safety and habitability of existing high-rises in our downtown core, but also for future developments in this seismically vulnerable area.

I understand that you are no longer willing to attend the hearing. As I relayed to you in our phone conversation earlier this week, I have directed our City Attorney to draft legislation allowing the Board of Supervisors to subpoena you and any related documents in your possession relative to the 80 Natoma and 301 Mission projects, including correspondence with peer review panelists, as a result.

I believe that your institutional knowledge of both of these projects, as well as your familiarity with the civil and environmental engineering requirements necessary to ensure state-of-the-art building standards are critical for the City to consider as we move forward with our own policy reforms.

I hope that you will reconsider the valuable role that you can play in assisting the City with these reforms, and I look forward to eventually working with you toward that end.

Best,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Aaron P. Peskin".

Aaron Peskin  
San Francisco Supervisor  
District 3

Member, Board of Supervisors  
District 3



City and County of San Francisco

AARON PESKIN

November 16, 2016

Tom C. Hui  
Department of Building Inspection, Director  
1660 Mission Street, Sixth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
CC: William Strawn; Lily Madjus; Erica Major

Dear Director Hui,

Thank you again for your cooperation thus far in the ongoing hearings on San Francisco building standards in seismic zones, as well as the specific safety review process for the 301 Mission Street project, otherwise known as the Millennium Tower.

In preparation for tomorrow's hearing, I wanted to follow up on any progress that the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) has made relative to securing and compiling relevant documents from key points in the 301 Mission vetting and approval process.

I have reviewed a screen shot of a revised January 2006 letter written by Hardip Pannu, one of the experts tapped to review the structural safety of the 301 Mission project. A reference to correspondence dated August 30, 2005 is included therein, but this 2005 correspondence is not included in the previous data dumps that you have transmitted, to the best of my knowledge. Please produce this or explain its absence.

I am curious as to why there is no documentation that DBI formally retained the services of either Mr. Pannu or Professor Moehle specifically as peer review panelists (as opposed to consultants) or any documentation delineating their anticipated scope of work. I am also curious as to why there is no letter confirming that DBI engineer Hanson Tom directed or requested peer review panelists Mr. Pannu and Professor Moehle to include the Transbay project in their review and analysis, as indicated in Mr. Pannu's January 2006 revision of the August 30, 2005 letter? By way of understanding the review timeline, please explain whether Mr. Pannu and Professor Moehle were hired before or after they did work for DeSimone Consulting Engineers?

Finally, I am still waiting for the four volume foundation permit application for the 301 Mission project, dated May 24, 2005 and prepared by DeSimone Consulting Engineers for the Department of Building Inspection, referencing Project 4069. At our last hearing, we touched on the practice of keeping original hard copies of key documents like permits, charge letters and permit applications, much like marriage or business license applications. I wanted to confirm in writing what the Department's practice has been with respect to these documents and whether or not you have retained the actual letters themselves, as required.

Please let my staff know if we can expect these documents or written responses to these questions within the next week.

Thank you again for your cooperation,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Aaron P.L.", with a stylized, cursive script.

Aaron Peskin  
San Francisco Supervisor  
District 3