

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



ITEM
3.33
(ID # 7916)

MEETING DATE:

Tuesday, September 11, 2018

FROM : EXECUTIVE OFFICE:

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE OFFICE: Response to the 2017-2018 Grand Jury Report: Riverside County - County Service Area 126 Highgrove Communication Shortcomings, District 2. [Total Cost \$0]

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:


1. Approve, with or without modification, the attached response to the 2017-2018 Grand Jury Report: Riverside County – County Service Area 126 Highgrove Communication Shortcomings; and,
2. Direct the Clerk of the Board to immediately forward the Board' finalized responses to the Grand Jury, the Presiding Judge and to the County Clerk-Recorder (for mandatory filing with the state).

ACTION: Policy

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Jeffries, seconded by Supervisor Perez and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Washington, Perez and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Tavaglione
Date: September 11, 2018
xc: EO, Grand Jury, Presiding Judge, CSA. Recorder

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By 
Deputy

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

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost
COST	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NET COUNTY COST	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SOURCE OF FUNDS: N/A			Budget Adjustment: No	
			For Fiscal Year: 2018/19	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: Approve.

BACKGROUND:

Summary

Penal Code Section 933(c) requires Board of Supervisors comment on the Grand Jury's recommendations pertaining to matters under the Board's control. In addition, responses must be provided to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 90 days of receipt of the report.


Nehini Basina, Principal Management Analyst 8/29/2018


Lisa D Brandl 9/7/2018


Lisa D Brandl 9/6/2018


Gregory V. Priamos, Director County Counsel 8/29/2018

2017/18 Grand Jury Report
Riverside County Economic Development Agency
June 13, 2018

GRAND JURY FINDINGS:

Grand Jury Finding #1:

While the CSA 126 management has a policy of openness and transparency, it has not effectively communicated changes and agreements. Previous efforts by Riverside County officials to inform CSA 126 residents through public meetings have proved to be inadequate. Citizens don't understand how CSA agreements were designed to work and how the funds are managed. For complete record access, a citizen would need to inquire at the Jurupa Valley Sheriff Station, the EDA, the landscaping contractor, a County Supervisor, Tax Collector, Assessor, and occasionally state records.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #1:

Disagree

County Service Areas (CSAs) are governed by the Board of Supervisors under Government Code 25215 et seq. CSAs are an alternative method of providing enhanced governmental services within an unincorporated area such as local park maintenance services, street lighting, landscape services and street sweeping. All residents paying a CSA assessment are provided contact information on their property tax bill, as is the case for all taxing entities. In addition, CSA operations posts a hotline number on all park signs for residents needing to inquire about activities at the park. CSA staff attend community meetings and town halls in order to provide information to the citizens. In addition, CSA residents have access to information related to a variety of services provided including contact information for administration through the CSA website at www.rivoccsd.org

Grand Jury Finding #2:

An inspection of the other services that the CSA 126 funds are drawn upon to provide, revealed that the park, park maintenance, lighting and median landscaping are in excellent condition. Interviews of random citizens using the park and community center resulted in nothing but praise and some of them came from quite a distance to use the facilities.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #2:

Agree

Administration takes pride in the services they provide to the residents of Riverside County.

GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Grand Jury Recommendation #1:

CSA 126 management provide a one-time public notice clarifying exactly how the CSA 126 funds are distributed. This notice should include the number of assessed parcels, the amount per parcel for different housing areas, and any current agreements and contracts in effect. At least once every two years, CSA management should make a summary report available online and at a public meeting open to all Highgrove residents. This effort is appropriate and necessary since there is no current forum to discuss such issues in the Highgrove Community. Part of the summary of contracts and agreements should explain the effective date and cost of the current chain of agreements between CSA 126 management and the Jurupa Valley Sheriff Station for focused law enforcement coverage.

Response to Grand Jury #1:

Recommendation is currently implemented.

Administration submits all CSAs assessments, parcel count and assessment range to the Board of Supervisors for approval annually with a public hearing. All agreements are submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval and are noticed to the public. Residents requesting specific information regarding their assessment are provided contact information on their tax bill. Specifically for CSA 126, staff attended a series of community meetings over a two year period in Highgrove to discuss community wide budget challenges.

Grand Jury Recommendation #2:

CSA 126 management should continue to seek and employ the best qualified contractors to maintain CSA 126 services at the highest possible level and lowest cost.

Response to Grand Jury Recommendation #2:

Recommendation is currently implemented

CSA follows County Purchasing guidelines for contracting services. Administration will continue to ensure the best qualified contractors are selected to maintain CSA 126.