



RBOC?

July 29, 2006

Have the foxes been appointed?

In November 2002 voters gave the SFPUC a blank check and ceded their right to control the issuance of revenue bonds. Voters did approve the Proposition P, which created an independent, autonomous and multidisciplinary Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC).

Proposition P Section 5.31(e) (Admin Code amendment) states; "The Board shall, without expending revenue bonds, provide the Committee with appropriate clerical, technical and administrative services in furtherance of its purposes." Section 5.33 (b) stated; "At a minimum the individuals appointed by the Mayor and Board shall, individually have expertise, skills and experiences in economics, the environment, construction and project management..." Section 3.31 (6) under Establishment and Purpose; states, "Commissioning independent review and evaluation of the disbursement and expenditures of the (RB) proceeds..."

Currently all support for the RBOC is provided by the SFPUC and the RBOC meets in the HQ offices of the SFPUC. The President of the Board has not responded as to why the RBOC is not *supplied* by the Board as mandated by 5.31(e) to ensure an autonomous and independent body.

Two members of the three RBOC Audit-Selection Working Group (ASWG), SFPUC and Controller staff voted in the selection of the RBOC's first outside auditor (chosen from an approved list). The GM and DGM were shown the final draft of this audit prior to the full Committee. The selection meeting and voting process were not publicly noted. As the "missing" member of the (ASWG), I discovered the inwards of this otherwise hidden process through a Sunshine request.

The RBOC instituted an Informational Policy (IP), prohibiting information requests of the SFPUC, by individual members of the Committee. Requests must be presented to the full committee at scheduled meetings and approved by vote. The Chair of the RBOC explained that this process allowed for a "united front." This policy is completely contrary to the multidisciplinary concept underscoring the creation of an autonomous and independent RBOC. Autonomy and independence are made further meaningless by the current institutional coziness of the RBOC with the SFPUC. This coziness was not intended by the authors or envisioned by the voters.

This policy, alone, begs the very question of why create an independent, multidisciplinary body of inquiry to protect the ratepayers? The decision by the Chair and Vice Chair to arbitrarily show the GM and AGM the audit without full consent of the entire Committee seems inconsistent with this so called Informational Policy? Is this informational policy a selective policy?

Brian Browne

Board of Supervisors No.1 Chair, RBOC and co-author Proposition P.