From: Carsillo, William R CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
To: Cummins, John M CIV NAVFAC SW
Cc: Gilkey, Douglas E CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Larson, Elizabeth A CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Subject: RE: Retrocession of Jurisdiction
Date: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 1:28:30 PM

Per our discussion, agree retrocession would be necessary if there were areas to be used by the City under a LIFOC. The Conveyance Agreement did not address this issue as such. It covers security matters under the Protection and Maint. provisions. Also, as discussed, if we do a LIFOC with the City we probably need to modify the Conveyance Agr to set it up since the LIFOC includes a firm commitment by the City to take title to the property when it is FOSTed. Bill

-----Original Message-----
From: Cummins, John M CIV NAVFAC SW
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 17:42
To: Larson, Elizabeth A CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Carsillo, William R CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Cc: Gilkey, Douglas E CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Subject: Retrocession of Jurisdiction

Team,

We should consider whether retrocession of jurisdiction covering the "exclusive" portions of HPS is advisable. At this point, there are portions of HPS that can be policed by the City and Navy and there are portions that can only be policed by the Navy. That is, there are portions of the base on which the San Francisco Police Department has no authority to make arrests. This can be confusing and interfere with law enforcement efforts. When Parcels D2 and 49 are conveyed, there could be an even more complicated hodgepodge of jurisdictions. This may become more of a problem once the stadium is built and the base becomes a draw for people throughout the region. For these reasons, we may want to couple the transfer of Parcel 49 to a general retrocession of jurisdiction on the "exclusive" (partial) areas of federal jurisdiction.
If so, the retrocession process could be incorporated into the HPS Early Transfer Schedule.

John