



**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FROM: Supervisor Kevin Jeffries & Supervisor Jeff Stone **SUBMITTAL DATE:** July 10, 2013

SUBJECT: Board Policy Reforms for Agendas and Form 11

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors direct the Executive Office to implement reforms to the Agenda and Form 11 process to increase public transparency and better organize Form 11s to more clearly disclose short and long term impacts of Board actions to the county budget and the private sector by:

- 1) Requiring Form 11s to be submitted simultaneously with requests to place items on agendas;
- 2) Including costs/savings in public agenda item summaries;
- 3) Including total project/contract costs within financial data, rather than simply fiscal year costs;
- 4) Specifying ongoing costs of operations for capital projects, and the source of those costs;
- 5) Detailing the context of change orders;
- 6) Including a brief analysis of the private sector impacts of certain board actions.

BACKGROUND: To increase transparency and accessibility to the public, as well as to improve our ability to obtain relevant information on issues appearing before the Board, the Board of Supervisors directs the Executive Office to develop reforms to address the following issues with Agenda Items and Form 11 layout and information:

Kevin Jeffries
Supervisor, 1st District

Jeff Stone
Supervisor, 3rd District

(Background continued on page 2)

2013 JUL 10 PM 2:22

CLERK/REGISTRAR OF SUPERVISORS
RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Prev.Agn.ref.

Dist.

AGENDA NO.

3-66

SUBJECT: Board Policy Reforms for Agendas and Form 11
(Page 2)

BACKGROUND CONTINUED:

- 1) **No Empty Agenda Items/Include Detail within Brown Act Window:** Items should not be placed on the Board Agenda for hearing unless the completed Form 11 is also available to the public (and Board members) prior to the agenda submission deadline.
- 2) **Expenditure Transparency on Public Agendas:** The publicly available agenda item descriptions should include appropriate costs/savings within, whether it be a construction cost, a contract amount, or an appropriation, one shouldn't have to read the attachments online to determine whether an agenda item is spending \$5,000 versus \$500,000 versus \$5,000,000. Those numbers should be plainly available to a member of the public on the agenda that is distributed at board meetings.
- 3) **Total Costs Disclosed in Financial Data:** In the "Financial Data" section of the Form 11, there needs to be a line item for the grand total amount of the entire contract or purchase or construction project, or any similar budget item, and not simply the cost in the current fiscal year. Similarly, any increase in a program should clearly indicate the new total cost of the program.
- 4) **Operations Costs Identified:** When a capital project is brought before the Board, the ongoing annual costs of operation or programs at the future facility and the source of funding (whether it be CSA, DIF, Agency Funds, General Fund, grants, etc.) for those costs need to be identified within the Form 11 in an easily identifiable format.
- 5) **Change Order Context:** When a change order is brought before the Board, the request should include, in a readily identifiable format, the amount of the change order, the amount of previous change orders, the amount that was approved for construction of the project, and the current cost of the project.
- 6) **Include Impact to Private Sector in Background:** Separate from the fiscal impact to the county, each new ordinance, regulation, program, or fee should include a private sector impact analysis that briefly discusses the fiscal or regulatory impact, if any, to taxpayers, residents, and employers in Riverside County.

The Executive Office may determine the best approach to accomplish these goals, but Kern County does a good job of summarizing costs in their public agendas (example linked here: http://kern.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=kern_a07096395a8c26d07c936d0f0ac140c7.pdf&view=1) and may serve as a good model to follow. Similarly, San Diego County identifies a very clear "Fiscal Impact" and "Business Impact" (similar to what is being proposed with a "Private Sector Impact" above) within their Board Reports which may serve as a good example for what we are trying to accomplish here with items 3, 4, and 6 (example linked here: http://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/CASAND/2013/05/10/file_attachments/210331/15%2BMay%2B2013%20Regular%20agendaFINAL.pdf)