



THE THOMAS JEFFERSON
INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Thomas Jefferson

Government Transparency in Virginia
How Localities Compare

By:

Jeremy Beales

and

Michael W. Thompson

January 2010

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy

The Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy is a non-partisan research and education organization devoted to improving the lives of the people in Virginia. The Institute was organized in 1996, and was the only state and local government focused public policy foundation in Virginia based on a philosophy of limited government, free enterprise and individual responsibility. It is a “solutions tank” seeking better ways to accomplish the policies and programs currently being undertaken by state and local government – always based on the Institute’s underlying philosophy. The first study was published in February 1997.

The work of the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy is geared toward educating our political, business and community leadership about the issues facing our society here in Virginia. The Institute offers creative solutions to these problems in a non-partisan manner.

The Thomas Jefferson Institute is a fully approved foundation by the Internal Revenue Service. It is designated a 501 (c) 3 organization and contributions are tax-deductible under the law. Individuals, corporations, associations and foundations are invited to contribute to the Thomas Jefferson Institute and participate in our programs.

For more information on the programs and publications of the Thomas Jefferson Institute, please contact:

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy
9035 Golden Sunset Lane
Springfield, Virginia 22153
703/440-9447
email: info@thomasjeffersoninst.org
website: www.thomasjeffersoninst.org

This paper, “*Government Transparency in Virginia: How Localities Compare*” is published by the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy. This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the Thomas Jefferson Institute or its Board of Directors. Nothing in this study should be construed as an attempt to hinder or aid any legislation.

Government Transparency in Virginia: How Localities Compare

Introduction

Government transparency has quickly become an important public policy issue. Available technology to post detailed information on government websites has fueled this growing interest to have ready access to how government at the state and local levels spend our tax money.

The Thomas Jefferson Institute has worked with the Governor's Office, the Cost Cutting Caucus and State Senator Walter Stosch in bringing a large amount of financial information and analysis to the state websites. However, this information is not always easy to understand or compare between agencies and programs.

This unique study rates Virginia's 134 localities on the degree to which their websites provide fiscal transparency. Most localities in our state can do much better. We hope this analysis helps these local governments focus more attention on their financial transparency. Improving what is made available to the taxpayers is not expensive. In many cases it does not take a lot of time to post onto websites the available budget information outlined in this analysis.

Budget documents can either be arcane or they can be informational. As governments post their budget documents online, the citizens will naturally demand that these documents become more user friendly, more detailed, and written in a manner that is easily understood by our citizens.

This first analysis by the Thomas Jefferson Institute will hopefully help local governments focus more attention on making their financial documents available on county and city websites. After all, government is funded through the taxes of its citizens and is led by elected officials who must answer to those who fund government.

We hope this initial analysis and rating of local governments here in Virginia will help move all governments forward in their efforts to be more open and more transparent. Our citizens expect this and the technology tools available to provide this information are easily attainable so there really is little excuse for local governments not to have the basic financial information available on their websites.

Michael W. Thompson, Chairman and President
Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy

Government Transparency in Virginia How Localities Compare

By: Jeremy Beales and Michael W. Thompson

The legitimacy of government is based on the consent of the governed. As individual owners, each one of us is entitled to complete information regarding how our government acts and what our elected representatives do. If we cannot keep ourselves informed on the workings of our government, we cannot retain control over our government. Across the country citizens have demanded that government checkbooks, contractor databases and general budget data be put online

Here in Virginia our state government has made some impressive efforts at opening up its operations. The [Commonwealth Data Point](#)¹ service has put the state's checkbook online and allows citizens to access information on a program by program basis. [Virginia Performs](#)² allows citizens to check in on how state agencies are doing and see their success at hitting targeted goals. Furthermore, private individuals in Virginia have taken the lead on opening up government information to citizens, with non-profit websites like the [Virginia Public Access Project](#)³, [Richmond Sunlight](#)⁴ and the [Virginia Coalition for Open Government](#)⁵ repackaging government data and making it far more user-friendly. Sometimes, though, we fail to even provide enough context for a private group to make good use of the data provided. While [Virginia's Budget Site](#)⁶ has an admirable amount of information available, most of it is provided in a difficult to follow and hard to understand format. Similarly, the [Legislative Information System](#)⁷ pales in comparison to Richmond Sunlight, which provides the same information in an infinitely more useable manner. In other instances, as is the case in many counties across the Commonwealth, even rudimentary data on government operations via the internet is not provided.

The internet has opened up a new, more vibrant public square where debates about all sorts of local issues happen, with greater frequency and inclusiveness than in previous eras. As its use and the universe of those using it continues to expand, expectations for how people access information, and how much information is available, are rapidly changing.

Local blogs, message boards and listservs have made it easier for citizens to engage in public debates and make their voices heard on questions of local governance. These tools have radically lowered the barrier to becoming involved in public debate and have greatly increased the ability of citizens to hold their government to account. It has also made it far easier for local governments to engage their residents on questions of governance and public spending.

Governments on the leading edge of the transparency movement have put up one-stop-shops where those interested can access everything they need to become a citizen budget analyst. Everything that the government relies on to make its budget choices can be put online at very minimal expense. In part because it is so much easier to provide these levels of transparency, citizens now have a higher expectation for government openness. While some localities here in Virginia have raced ahead of the curve, many others have lagged far behind.

Some, such as Fairfax County, provide an easy to find [budget page](#)⁸ with full documents. Others, such as Arlington County, go a step further and include context about the budget right on [their budget page](#)⁹, making it easier for citizens to find the document they need. Some, like Loudoun County, go one step beyond that and provide an [online video archive](#)¹⁰ of all the public meetings related to the budget process. But others, like Powhatan County, merely [provide a list of documents](#)¹¹, without any context or information about hearings or meeting dates. And then there is Patrick County, which doesn't provide [any discoverable budget information](#)¹² at all, beyond what is mentioned in their Board of Supervisors Minutes. As part of the effort to improve government transparency here in Virginia, the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy examined the current practices of the state's 134 localities. This effort has attempted to define baseline standards and best practices and assess how Virginia localities compare.

METHODOLOGY

We felt that counties should have a single, easily accessible website or webpage where all of their budget information is posted, something that keeps citizens from going to five different places on the county website to find the budget information they are looking for. Ideally all the relevant information, items like past years budgets, contractor information and expenditure data would be in one place. At a minimum it should be linked to from one place and we wanted more than just a list of documents; a little explanation goes a long way in terms of ensuring citizens know what they are looking for and once they find it, what it means.

Keeping people apprised of events as they unfolded is important as well. Approving a budget is a fluid, dynamic process and that should be well represented in the information provided. A county's budget documents should be posted online from the start of the process on through completion. Updates should be made available for the proposed budget as it goes through markup and again as it reaches final passage. Detail is crucial as well and we wanted to see data down to the program level, a point that allows citizens to see how much is being spent on each program or office the county runs. We were also hoping to see some form of an online checkbook. The federal government and many states have already implemented this, allowing citizens to see everything the government spends money on. And finally, given that all sorts of functions that used to be governmental are now contracted out to the private sector, we wanted that information online as well.

We graded each municipality on a 100 point scale, using 16 criteria, which were not weighted equally and can, as roughly outlined above, be broken into four groupings:

Budget Documents Presented (36 Points):

This category looked for the inclusion of a Portal Page (5 points), Archives (5), the Advertised and Adopted Budget (5 and 10 respectively), Markup Information (5) as well as the Carryover Package (3). In this section we also looked for localities to include some context (3) so citizens would understand what document they were looking at and how it fit into the larger picture. Now, while the majority of these items can be objectively measured – either the

municipalities provided them or they did not – the context and portal page items were obviously more subjective. In terms of a portal page we felt that there should be a single, easily accessible website or webpage where all of their budget information is posted. Ideally all the relevant information, items like past years budgets, contractor information, and expenditure data would all be in one place, but at a minimum it would be linked to from one place. For both the context and portal categories, we used [Arlington](#)¹³ as the standard and judged other sites against. For the archives category, scoring full points required that the municipality went back five years or more. Less than that garnered half points.

Extent (25 Points):

Here we went one step beyond simply having the documents and looked at what exactly was in them. We felt that budget documents should provide data down to the program level (10, half credit was given for drilling down to department level), allowing citizens to see how much is being spent on each program or office the county runs. We also were looking for the documents to be both searchable (5, full points if it was indexed in Google, half if you could only search within the pdf document) and available in easy to access formats, such as Microsoft Excel files (5, half if there was a disclaimer urging you to contact county staff for it in this format), allowing citizens to truly drill down, manipulate data and make comparisons across time and against other localities.

The last thing we tried to evaluate was how timely documents were posted. This proved challenging. Some were easy, such as the municipalities that haven't managed to post anything for fiscal year 2010. But for localities that have information posted on their websites it is difficult to tell when it was posted, especially in regard to that locality's budget process. Future transparency analyses will ask municipalities to provide us with information on their policies to help evaluate this category.

Expenditure Information (25 Points):

This is where the vaunted online checkbook (10, half points were given for the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report) was taken into account. The federal government and many states have already implemented online checkbooks that allow citizens to see everything the government spends money on; there is no reason counties cannot as well. Reports should be posted frequently and timeliness in updates was considered as well (5, full points for updates presented monthly or more frequently, half points if updates were given in a time frame greater than one month but less than every six months). We were also looking for low thresholds to trigger inclusion (5, \$2,500 minimums) and all agencies to be included (5).

Contract Information (14 Points):

Government doesn't do everything it once did. All sorts of functions that used to be governmental are now contracted out to the private sector. Counties need to release that information. Here, we were looking for fairly basic information such as who got contracts, what for and how much (5, half if only one was missed). We also expected contact information on the contractor (3), a threshold of \$2,500 for reporting (3) and for information on performances

standards (3). This is one area where we wish we had a better handle on what was already being offered. In future transparency analyses we will score localities on having requests for proposals online and having an easy to use database of contracting so that citizens can see where their money is being spent.

RESULTS BY LOCALITY

Localities in Virginia were generally dismal in their efforts at online financial transparency. The highest grade in the survey was 80 out of 100 points and only 20 localities scored more than 50 points. On the other side 22 localities scored zero points and another 13 scored fewer than 20 points. Last place in our survey went to Buchanan county, which does not even have a website, let alone any online budget or financial information.

The localities that scored the highest were overwhelmingly the most populated areas of the state. The top three scorers were the Northern Virginia counties of Arlington, Fairfax and Prince William, while the rest of the highest scoring group was heavily slanted towards the other jurisdictions in Northern Virginia along with jurisdictions surrounding Richmond and Hampton Roads.

There were several common threads in terms of where localities lost points on the survey. In the documents presented section the most common fault was localities failing to put anything other than their adopted budget online. In total, 104 jurisdictions presented their adopted budget, but only 46 presented their initial budget proposals. Only two localities, Arlington and Fairfax counties, presented all five of the budget documents we were looking for. Most counties that presented adopted budgets did relatively well in the detail category. Relatively few presented budget data that was only a summary, as opposed to program level and very few presented budget documents that were not searchable by any means. One jurisdiction that does deserve special recognition in the detail category is Buckingham County, which was the only locality that presented an Excel file of their budget.

Many jurisdictions had serious problems in the expenditure information category as well. While the survey required an online checkbook to score full points for spending information, only one locality was able to score full points for it. Most localities did, however, present their Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), which earned some points in the category and some went beyond even that. Two cities, Alexandria and Williamsburg, went beyond just the CAFR and presented monthly or quarterly spending updates. Goochland County went the furthest, posting a full check register on a monthly basis, making it the only county in Virginia to get full points for the expenditure information category.

The last category on the survey – contract information - was another where most jurisdictions were found lacking. While many jurisdictions posted requests for proposals online, only 10 jurisdictions posted information about awarded contracts online.

(See the attachment to this study for the spreadsheet showing how well each local government is doing on government.)

IMPROVEMENTS TO STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

If all of Virginia's counties and school boards met the standards outlined in this analysis we would be a much more informed and aware citizenry, but this is just the tip of the iceberg. Simply following through on these measures, while a significant upgrade over the hodge-podge collection of documents that passes for transparency throughout much of the commonwealth, doesn't take full advantage of power of the internet.

There are a several additional improvements that governments can make that enable their citizens to get much more out of online transparency. From video archives to real time data feeds, innovative governments are making themselves more open and their constituents better informed. Future editions of this study will attempt to give a better impression of these other elements of online transparency. Many local governments in Virginia do go above and beyond the baseline of what was expected in this study, while others present the bare minimum of information with no additional frills. Localities that offer more than the minimum should be recognized for their extra efforts to inform their citizens and those that have bare minimum websites that look like they were created in 1995 should also be pointed out.

While most Virginia localities have a long way to go in terms of online transparency, any county that presented all of the documents we looked at would be in the top tier of local governments nationwide, even if they did nothing else. Local governments looking to improve their online transparency should aim to provide the baseline of documents we looked for. Presenting documents from each step of the budget process is the biggest improvement to be made; this would allow citizens to track the budget as it is put together. All of these documents already exist in county government and it is easy to upload them and get them online. Similarly, governments already have all of their contracting information available, so putting it online for citizens to peruse is an easy way to drastically improve a locality's score.

(Jeremy Beales is the co-editor of the Bacon's Rebellion electronic magazine. He is currently a student at George Mason University's School of Law. He graduated from George Mason University with a degree in Government and International Politics.

Michael W. Thompson is the Chairman and President of the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy, Virginia's premier independent public policy foundation. He founded and owned his own company for 24 years in Springfield, VA and was also president of a family owned furniture business in Georgia during those years. Thompson is the former Chairman of VA NFIB with 6,000 small business members and continues to serve on its board of directors)

Jurisdiction Sorted in Alphabetical Order

Locality	Budget Documents Presented (36 Points)							Extent	
	Portal Page (5)	Archives (5)	Provides Context (3)	Advertised Budget (5)	Markup Information (5)	Adopted Budget (10)	Carryover Package (3)	Data to Program Level (10)	Searchable Data (5)
Accomack County	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Albemarle County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Alleghany County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amelia County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amherst County	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	0
Appomattox County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington County	5	5	3	5	5	10	3	10	5
Augusta County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Bath County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Bedford County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Bland County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	5	2.5
Botetourt County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brunswick County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Buchanan County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buckingham County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Campbell County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	5	2.5
Caroline County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Carroll County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Charles City County	2.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	2.5
Charlotte County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Chesterfield County	2.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
City of Alexandria	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Bedford	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Bristol	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Buena Vista	2.5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Charlottesville	5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Chesapeake	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Colonial Heights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Covington	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Danville	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Emporia	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
City of Fairfax	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Falls Church	5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Franklin	2.5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Fredericksburg	5	2.5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Galax	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Hampton	5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Harrisonburg	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Hopewell	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Lexington	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Lynchburg	0	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Manassas	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Manassas Park	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Martinsville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Newport News	5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5

(25 Points)		Expenditure Information (25 Points)				Contract Information				Total Score
Provides Excel File (5)	Posted in Timely Manner (5)	Online Checkbook (10)	Updated Frequently (5)	Low Minimum (5)	Comprehensive (5)	Contract Information (5)	Contractor Information (3)	Low Minimum (3)	Performance Standards (3)	
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	48
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	53
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.5	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	3	3	80
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	7.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	15
0	5	5	5	5	2.5	0	0	0	0	58
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	47.5
0	5	5	2.5	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	50
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45.5
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	7.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	12.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	55.5
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	50.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	3	3	59
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	3	3	56.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	50

Jurisdiction Sorted in Alphabetical Order

Locality	Budget Documents Presented (36 Points)							Extent	
	Portal Page (5)	Archives (5)	Provides Context (3)	Advertised Budget (5)	Markup Information (5)	Adopted Budget (10)	Carryover Package (3)	Data to Program Level (10)	Searchable Data (5)
City of Norfolk	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Norton	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
City of Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Poquoson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Portsmouth	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Radford	5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Richmond	5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Roanoke	5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Salem	5	2.5	0	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Staunton	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Suffolk	5	0	0	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Virginia Beach	5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Waynesboro	2.5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Williamsburg	5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Winchester	5	0	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Clarke County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Craig County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Culpeper County	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Cumberland County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Dickenson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dinwiddie County	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	0
Essex County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	0
Fairfax County	5	5	3	5	5	10	3	10	5
Fauquier County	2.5	5	0	5	5	10	0	10	5
Floyd County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
Fluvanna County	2.5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Franklin County	0	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Frederick County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Giles County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Gloucester County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Goochland County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Grayson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	0	0	5	0
Greensville County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Halifax County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Hanover County	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Henrico County	5	2.5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Henry County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Highland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isle of Wight County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
James City County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King and Queen County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King George County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
King William County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
Lancaster County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5

(25 Points)		Expenditure Information (25 Points)				Contract Information				Total Score
Provides Excel File (5)	Posted in Timely Manner (5)	Online Checkbook (10)	Updated Frequently (5)	Low Minimum (5)	Comprehensive (5)	Contract Information (5)	Contractor Information (3)	Low Minimum (3)	Performance Standards (3)	
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	50.5
0	0	5	2.5	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	53
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	53
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	47.5
0	0	0	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45
0	0	5	2.5	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	55.5
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	48
0	0	5	5	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	58
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	48
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45.5
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	3	3	77.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	1	3	0	0	59
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	55.5
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	53
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	5	10	5	5	5	5	3	0	0	65.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	48
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	0	3	61.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	0	0	40.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35

Jurisdiction Sorted in Alphabetical Order

Locality	Budget Documents Presented (36 Points)							Extent	
	Portal Page (5)	Archives (5)	Provides Context (3)	Advertised Budget (5)	Markup Information (5)	Adopted Budget (10)	Carryover Package (3)	Data to Program Level (10)	Searchable Data (5)
Lee County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Loudoun County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Louisa County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Lunenburg County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madison County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Mathews County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Mecklenburg County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middlesex County	2.5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	0
Montgomery County	2.5	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Nelson County	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
New Kent County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	3	10	2.5
Northampton County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Northumberland County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Nottoway County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	0
Orange County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Page County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
Patrick County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsylvania County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Powhatan County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Prince Edward County	2.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2.5
Prince George County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Prince William County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Pulaski County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Rappahannock County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Richmond County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Roanoke County	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Rockbridge County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Rockingham County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Russell County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scott County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shenandoah County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Smyth County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Southampton County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Spotsylvania County	2.5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Stafford County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Surry County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Sussex County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	5	0
Tazewell County	2.5	2.5	0	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Warren County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Westmoreland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wise County	0	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	5
Wythe County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
York County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5

(25 Points)		Expenditure Information (25 Points)				Contract Information				Total Score
Provides Excel File (5)	Posted in Timely Manner (5)	Online Checkbook (10)	Updated Frequently (5)	Low Minimum (5)	Comprehensive (5)	Contract Information (5)	Contractor Information (3)	Low Minimum (3)	Performance Standards (3)	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	53
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	0	0	0	47.5
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
0	0	5	2.5	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45
0	0	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	17.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	40
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	5	3	3	3	67
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.5
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.5
0	5	0	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	35
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.5
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22.5
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	55.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	42.5
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	30
0	5	5	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	0	45

Jurisdiction Sorted by Total Score

Locality	Budget Documents Presented (36 Points)							Extent	
	Portal Page (5)	Archives (5)	Provides Context (3)	Advertised Budget (5)	Markup Information (5)	Adopted Budget (10)	Carryover Package (3)	Data to Program Level (10)	Searchable Data (5)
Arlington County	5	5	3	5	5	10	3	10	5
Fairfax County	5	5	3	5	5	10	3	10	5
Prince William County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Goochland County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Henrico County	5	2.5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Hampton	5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Fauquier County	2.5	5	0	5	5	10	0	10	5
City of Alexandria	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Williamsburg	5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Lynchburg	0	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Falls Church	5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Virginia Beach	5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Fluvanna County	2.5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Spotsylvania County	2.5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Albemarle County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Richmond	5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Roanoke	5	5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Frederick County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Loudoun County	5	5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Fredericksburg	5	2.5	3	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Radford	5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Charlottesville	5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Newport News	5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Accomack County	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Waynesboro	2.5	2.5	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
City of Winchester	5	0	3	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Hanover County	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Buena Vista	2.5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Salem	5	2.5	0	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Montgomery County	2.5	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Chesapeake	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Fairfax	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Manassas	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Dinwiddie County	5	5	3	0	0	10	0	10	0
City of Portsmouth	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Suffolk	5	0	0	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Mathews County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Powhatan County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Surry County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
York County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Bedford County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Franklin	2.5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Norfolk	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Stafford County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Washington County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5

Jurisdiction Sorted by Total Score

Locality	Budget Documents Presented (36 Points)							Extent	
	Portal Page (5)	Archives (5)	Provides Context (3)	Advertised Budget (5)	Markup Information (5)	Adopted Budget (10)	Carryover Package (3)	Data to Program Level (10)	Searchable Data (5)
Wise County	0	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	5
King George County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
New Kent County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	3	10	2.5
City of Bedford	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Harrisonburg	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Manassas Park	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Gloucester County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Louisa County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Northampton County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Orange County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Prince George County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Carroll County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Danville	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Culpeper County	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Franklin County	0	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
King William County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
Madison County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Middlesex County	2.5	5	0	5	0	10	0	10	0
Sussex County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	5	0
Tazewell County	2.5	2.5	0	5	5	10	0	10	2.5
Augusta County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Bristol	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Hopewell	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Lexington	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
City of Staunton	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Cumberland County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Henry County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Lancaster County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Rockingham County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Southampton County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Buckingham County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Caroline County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
City of Norton	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Isle of Wight County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Northumberland County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Page County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
Pittsylvania County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Roanoke County	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Rockbridge County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Amherst County	5	2.5	3	0	0	10	0	10	0
Charlotte County	2.5	5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Wythe County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
City of Covington	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	10	2.5
Richmond County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5

Jurisdiction Sorted by Total Score

Locality	Budget Documents Presented (36 Points)							Extent	
	Portal Page (5)	Archives (5)	Provides Context (3)	Advertised Budget (5)	Markup Information (5)	Adopted Budget (10)	Carryover Package (3)	Data to Program Level (10)	Searchable Data (5)
Shenandoah County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Floyd County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
Nelson County	0	2.5	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Bath County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Bland County	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	5	2.5
Brunswick County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Essex County	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	0
Halifax County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Pulaski County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	2.5
Smyth County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Giles County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Prince Edward County	2.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2.5
Rappahannock County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2.5
Charles City County	2.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	2.5
Chesterfield County	2.5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Nottoway County	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	0
Campbell County	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	5	2.5
City of Emporia	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Greene County	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	0	0	5	0
Botetourt County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Colonial Heights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alleghany County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amelia County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Appomattox County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greensville County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Galax	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Martinsville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Poquoson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clarke County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Craig County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickenson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grayson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
James City County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King and Queen County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lee County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lunenburg County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mecklenburg County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Patrick County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russell County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scott County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westmoreland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FOOTNOTES/LINKS

¹ <http://datapoint.apa.virginia.gov/>

² <http://vaperforms.virginia.gov/>

³ <http://vpap.org/>

⁴ <http://www.richmondsunlight.com/>

⁵ <http://opengovva.org/>

⁶ <http://dpb.virginia.gov/budget/vabudget.cfm>

⁷ <http://leg1.state.va.us/>

⁸ <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/Government/budget/>

⁹ <http://www.arlingtonva.us/departments/ManagementAndFinance/budget/page67119.aspx>

¹⁰ http://loudoun.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=35

¹¹ http://www.powhatanva.gov/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC=%7BDD006077-BDCC-48C3-824F-D05E826BF8BA%7D&DE=%7BFAB4949F-A749-4C7B-AD02-0DD654351F61%7D

¹² http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&rlz=1C1GGLS_enUS329US329&q=site:co.patrick.va.us+budget&aq=f&oq=&aqi=

¹³ <http://www.arlingtonva.us/departments/ManagementAndFinance/budget/page67119.aspx>

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy
Board of Directors

Michael Thompson: Chairman and President: For over twenty years Mr. Thompson owned his own marketing company. He has been very active in national, state and local politics as well as a number of state and community organizations, commissions, and committees, Springfield, VA.

Randal C. Teague: Secretary/Treasurer: A Partner in the law firm of Vorys, Sater Seymour and Pease, Washington, DC.

John Alderson: President of the John Alderson Insurance Agency, Daleville, VA.

Warren Barry: Former State Senator and small business owner. Heathsville, VA.

William W. Beach: Director of the Center for Data Analysis and John M. Olin Senior Fellow in Economics at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C.

James W. Beamer: Managing Director for Legislative Outreach, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., Richmond, VA.

Stephen Cannon: Chairman, Constantine Cannon, PC, former Sr. VP and General Counsel of Circuit City Stores, Washington DC

James W. Dyke, Jr: Partner, McGuireWoods and former Sec. of Education, McLean, VA.

Robert L. Hartwell: President, Hartwell Capitol Consulting, Sr Consultant to American Systems, International, Occoquan, VA.

Alan I. Kirshner: Chairman and CEO of Markel Corporation, Glen Allen, VA.

Jay Poole: Former V. P. for Agriculture Policy and Programs, Altria, Glen Allen, VA.

Joseph Ragan: Founder and President of Joe Ragan's Coffee, Springfield, VA.

John Rust: Partner, Rust and Rust law firm & former State Delegate, Fairfax, VA.

John Ryan: Retired Senior Counsel & Dir. of Gov't. Affairs for Bristol Myers Squibb, Washington DC.

Robert W. Shinn: President of Public Affairs, Capital Results, Richmond, VA.

Todd A. Stottlemeyer: Exec VP, Inova Health System, Fairfax, VA.

Dr. Robert F. Turner: Law professor at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Robert W. Woltz, Jr: President and CEO of Verizon-Virginia, Richmond, VA.



“... a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.”

Thomas Jefferson

1801

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy
9035 Golden Sunset Lane
Springfield, Virginia 22153
703.440.9447
info@thomasjeffersoninst.org
www.thomasjeffersoninst.org