

MINUTES
Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee
July 11, 2012, 2012
Conference Room 305 - City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

1) Call to Order, Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. Maura Lane, Committee Assistant, called the roll. All committee members were present except for Sanford Garfinkel, who was excused, and Thea Selby, Chair. Ms. Selby joined the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

2) The Committee met to discuss the following agenda item:

- a) Review the scope of work for a Community Engagement bond oversight report and decide on appropriate next steps;
- b) Review the scope of work for a Design Review bond oversight report and decide on appropriate next steps;
- c) Review other types of projects and related scopes of work for CGOBOC to engage consultants for bond oversight reports and decide on appropriate next steps.

The Committee called and discussed each item separately. There were no members of the public in attendance at any point during the meeting.

- a) Scope of work for a Design Review Engagement Bond Oversight Report: The Committee agreed that the reason for this work is to save money, to gain a better understanding of how the Community Engagement process works and to find ways to measure the quality of the outcomes. It was noted that the real cost to projects is often the result of delays.

The Committee agreed to return the draft Scope of Work for Consulting Services for Community Engagement Best Practices Review (May 14, 2012) to the Audit staff to incorporate the changes requested by the Committee and to include comparisons to other California cities and comparable businesses (benchmarking) The request was also made that the draft be written in a manner that includes more specifics, fewer generalities. CGOBOC's Chair and Vice Chair will work with CSA Audit staff to complete the draft. Audits will then work with the pool of previously approved contractors and select the best qualified for the scope of work defined for the contract. The recommendation will be returned to the Committee for final approval. It is expected that the contract will come before the Committee at the September 2012 meeting.

- b) Review the scope of work for a Design Review Bond Oversight Report and decide on appropriate next steps.

The Committee talked about the Report and what would be included in the scope of work. Overall, the response from the Committee regarding the scope of work content was positive. Other items will include the original and final budgets, identification of any structural hurdles regarding approvals within the City's framework, the reasons for the delays/hurdles and both the front/ back end of cost designs in order to learn from the old bond and inform the new bond. There was discussion as to whether specific bonds should be included, specifically General Hospital and ESER. The basis for comparison that was mentioned for the first item was also requested as well as costs implications.

The selection process of the consultants for the contract was reviewed. The projects selected will be relatively short so there will be, at most, two meetings with the consultants. The benchmarking process was also reviewed again.

c) Review of other types of projects and related scopes of work for CGOBOC to engage consultants for bond oversight reports and decide on appropriate steps.

The Committee raised the question about how best to audit projects that are funded by different funding streams. City Attorney Ken Roux responded by saying that to the degree that single elements of projects can be identified, his initial perspective is that the audit of the entire project should be possible. If there is a way to pull out a portion of the project, while still maintaining the integrity of the audit, then that would be the better option. Mr. Roux agreed to study the question further.

Ms. Lediju, Audits Director, agreed to provide benchmarking to the Committee in advance of the July 26, 2012 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.