



[Click Here To Close This Window](#)

---

## **Economy & Efficiency Commission**

# **Meeting Minutes**

---

### **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1996  
ROOM 830, KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 West Temple St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

*Editorial Note: Agenda sections may be taken out of order at the discretion of the chair. Any reordering of sections is reflected in the presentation of these minutes.*

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Buerk called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

#### **II. ATTENDANCE**

##### **COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

David A. Abel  
Fred Balderrama  
Richard D. Barger  
Gunther Buerk  
John Crowley  
Louise Frankel  
Jonathan Fuhrman  
Robert L. Glushon  
Christopher W. Hammond  
Jaclyn Tilley Hill  
Michael A. Jimenez  
Chun Lee  
Roman Padilla  
William Petak  
Marc A. Seidner  
Julia E. Sylva  
H. Randall Stoke

##### **COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED**

David Farrar

Carole Ojeda-Kimbrough  
Robert Philibosian  
Tony Tortorice

### **COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

None

Moved, Seconded, and Approved: The Commission members noted above be excused.

Commissioner Crowley commented that he appreciated this process which allows the Commission to know the reasons behind Commissioner absences.

### **III. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

Moved, Seconded, and Approved: The minutes of the October 2, 1996 Commission Meeting be approved.

### **IV. INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Hill announced that the Economy and Efficiency Commission will be included on the Executive Office's web page. Our listing includes a list of our reports by category and date. The Commissioners should have received a copy of the web page information in the mail. Currently the charge for ordering reports from the web page is \$10.00 a copy. Chairperson Buerk explained that this was to recoup the Commission's costs of printing and postage. Commissioner Abel expressed his concern over charging for reports. He feels the first priority of the Commission is to make the reports available to the public. Chairperson Buerk agreed and explained that when a report is first published it is mailed out to our general mailing list, which is very extensive, and anyone who requests a copy, without a charge. However, if someone is ordering a past report, he feels it is reasonable to institute a charge for that service. Commissioner Abel requested that the particulars of the fee be discussed at a later date. Chairperson Buerk agreed.

Chairperson Buerk Welcomed and introduced a new commissioner, Commissioner Marc Seidner, and asked him to tell the Commission about himself. Commissioner Seidner stated that he has always been a citizen of Los Angeles County. He has served on the Board of the Natural History Museum for sixteen (16) years and he served on the Board of Trustees for the Natural History Museum Foundation. He went to high school in Culver City and college at the University of Southern California. For the past thirty-three years he has been engaged in an international forest products business, and recently became involved in the manufacturing of accounting computer software. He is involved in a number of civic, charitable, and social organizations, including the Music Center. He has been married for twenty-two years and has two children.

### **V. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **1. ISD Restructuring / Purchasing Division Review**

Mr. Staniforth reported that ISD report has been distributed per the Commission's authorization. Since this was an internal document, distribution consisted of the Board, County staff and Commissioners. Mr. Staniforth asked if the Commissioners had any comments on the report. Commissioner Glushon asked if there was still an opportunity to utilize the work already done by Deloit Touch for the City, in purchasing. Mr. Staniforth replied that there are two separate issues under ISD. One is the ISD Restructuring report, that was just distributed, and the other is a Purchasing Department Audit that is still in process. He said that he would follow-up on Commissioner Glushon's suggestion to investigate existing information.

Commissioner Balderrama stated that ISD has dismantled all of its warehouse facility and they are no longer buying supplies in large quantities and storing them. Instead, they are using "just in time" ordering.

Commissioner Frankel asked Commissioner Balderrama how the inventory is dispersed now that they no longer have warehousing capabilities. Commissioner Balderrama responded that there is no inventory to distribute, ISD approves the purchases and they are shipped directly from the manufacturer. ISD has saved millions of dollars in eliminating the warehouse storage.

Commissioner Glushon asked if there were any other departments in the County not covered by ISD Purchasing. Commissioner Balderrama replied Public Works. Mr. Staniforth said that he did not know of any other departments that did not go through ISD.

Commissioner Stoke added that many of the departments function by virtue of the federal grants they receive. There

are grant problems in addition to the government management problems.

## **2. Constitutional Revision Commission**

Task Force Co-Chair Abel reported that the Task Force and the consultants met last week and focused on the areas to be covered in the report. He added that he had conducted an interview with Dave Janssen, CAO, and he shared some excerpts of that interview with the Commission.

Commissioner Abel stated that his discussions with Mr. Janssen related to the dysfunctional relationship that now exists between state and local government. Hopefully, the CRTF report can respond to this issue with recommendations. If the Commission decides to proceed, or if the Board wants the Commission to go further, additional issues can be examined in January or February.

Commissioner Frankel stated that the effects of the newly passed 218, which allows landowners to vote on taxes, should also be taken into account. Commissioner Abel replied that he had asked Mr. Janssen about the possible outcomes of 218 (prior to the election), and his response was, "The library system (County Library System) would lose \$9 million, about 25% of its budget, or would have to go to the voters to get its budget increased by that amount. The Fire Chief testified the \$53 million in benefit assessment would be in jeopardy." These were the two biggest items identified. There are exemptions for sewer, garbage and flood control assessment.

## **3. Real Asset Management**

In Task Force Chairperson Farrar's absence Mr. Staniforth reported that the progress report was finalized and distributed to the CAO and the full Commission. We have yet to receive any response from the CAO.

*Chairperson Buerk stated that Commissioner Padilla was running late and requested that the report on Unincorporated Areas be held until the end of the meeting.*

## **5. Department of Health Services**

In Task Force Chairperson Tortorice's absence Mr. Staniforth reported he met with Task Force Chairperson Tortorice who is reviewing a draft of a letter to Mark Finucane. Once he approves the letter they will hold a task force meeting to review the proposed response.

## **6. Natural History Museum**

Task Force Chairperson Hill reported that the task force will meet with Ray Fournier, County Counsel, next week to discuss the legal position on expenditures of the Museum Foundation.

## **7. Department of Human Resources / Department of Health Services**

Mr. Staniforth reported that we are still waiting for these departments to contact us with information on the strategy that the Board directed them to develop. Chairperson Buerk asked Mr. Staniforth to get a timeline from the departments.

Commissioner Hill stated that Dr. William Waddell, Chair of the Quality and Productivity Commission, requested a copy of the Board direction for the DHS project. Mr. Staniforth asked if he wanted the DHS Board direction or the DHR/DHS direction. Commissioner Hill replied that she would confirm with Mr. Waddell and contact the office.

## **8. Department of Public Social Services (DPSS)**

Task Force Chairperson Petak reported that the project remains in limbo, subject to the action taken on Welfare Reform. Our guest speaker today is the Director of DPSS, Lynn Bayer who will give us an update on the status of the department and we can ask her for direction for further study.

## **IV. PRESENTATIONS**

Ms. Lynn Bayer, Director  
Department of Public Social Services  
Topic: *The Future of the Department of Public Social Services*

Mr. Staniforth introduced Ms. Bayer to the Commission.

Chairperson Buerk explained that the Commission had been asked by the Board to review DPSS to suggest improvements prior to Ms. Bayer's appointment. After the Board request, Mr. Tanaka retired

and Welfare Reform was enacted, the study was subsequently placed on hold. The Commission is interested in hearing what is currently happening with DPSS in relation to funding, structure, etc.

Ms. Bayer stated that she would like to first talk about Welfare Reform and what direction DPSS is taking. The Board of Supervisors has unanimously approved a State Legislative Policy for the County. Los Angeles County is one of the first Counties in the State to adopt a policy. She stated she wanted to spend some time going over the policy and its importance, as well as, how DPSS is organizing itself and the challenge that the department faces.

Welfare Reform does two major things:

- 1) A budget cut - Illegal immigrants have never been supported by the welfare system. Welfare Reform eliminates benefits for legal immigrants in two major categories:
  - a) SSI is the program affecting the aged, blind and disabled. Los Angeles County has a disproportionate number of SSI recipients, approximately 300,000. 99,000 of this number are legal immigrants who are at risk of having their SSI eliminated.

In response to this, DPSS is instituting a naturalization program. DPSS is working with over 250 community based organizations. They have divided the County into 13 regions with a lead agency in each region. They also have an 800 number. INS and Social Security have been working very closely with DPSS on this project. Letters are being sent to legal immigrant SSI recipients to determine their status. Social Security administers the SSI program, not the County.

The reason the County is involved is if these individuals are eliminated from SSI they will likely become a part of the County's General Relief (GR) program. The maximum SSI benefit is \$640 per month and the GR benefits are \$212 per month. If 50% of the at risk SSI recipients qualify for GR, it would increase GR by \$100 million. The County is 100% responsible for GR. On a compassionate level and on a financial level it is important for the County to assist as many people as possible into citizenship.

Commissioner Stoke asked if the basis of elimination was because the sponsors were supposed to be responsible for the legal immigrant they sponsor. Ms. Bayer replied that what started the push to stop SSI benefits were reports that stated how families would bring their elderly relatives into the U.S. and immediately take them to Social Security Administration to have them eligible for SSI. Rather than correcting this process, the government decided to take everyone who was on SSI off of the program. The majority of this caseload are people who have been here 15-25 years. They are also taking refugees off the program after they have been here 5 years. These are individuals invited here by the Federal Government. There are many who are unable to take a meaningful oath due to their age and health. These are the type of people that DPSS is trying to provide with a safety net by working with the State on a program. The State has a share in the cost of the SSI program called SSP. In the unlikely event that all the legal immigrants come off the program, the State would save \$641 million in State General Fund dollars. DPSS is working with the State in using some of the savings that will be achieved in creating a safety net for the immigrants without family or sponsors.

Commissioner Frankel asked how families who brought over their elderly were able to put them in the SSI program when, as their sponsor, they were responsible for them. Ms. Bayer replied that they exploited the loopholes within the system. This is the part of the SSI system that should have been reformed rather than eliminated. There are primarily only four states that are affected by the legal immigrant issue: Florida, New York, Texas and California. This issue doesn't effect most people and it was 40% of the savings for Welfare Reform. Commissioner Barger commented that the awareness of the immigrant issue may be changing.

Chairperson Buerk asked Ms. Bayer if she believes that it is, specifically, the sponsorship of legal immigrants that is not working. Ms. Bayer agreed.

- b) Food Stamps: There are approximately 150,000 legal immigrants who are currently receiving food stamps which will be eliminated. This is \$120 million buying power that is taken out of the L.A. County economy.

Commissioner Barger asked how these people were going to be able to afford to eat. Ms. Bayer replied that this is the other major problem of the food stamp issue. Some will be able to rely on support groups of friends and family. DPSS has also been talking with various hunger organizations like the Interfaith Hunger Coalition, the food banks, the pantries, etc.

These organizations don't believe they will be able to handle the new need that will be created. Their stocking power has decreased in the past years due to major chain grocers selling products to "dent a can" stores that were once donated to the pantries and banks. Currently, she does not have an answer for this problem created by budget cuts, not reform, that affect the aged, blind, and disabled.

- 2) Reform - Aid to Federally Dependant Children Program (AFDC). DPSS is no longer an entitlement program that receives money when the case load increases and when the case load decrease the amount of money for the program does as well. DPSS is now on a block grant program with one sum of money to provide Welfare services to a population of people.

Commissioner Frankel asked if that was connected to SSI. Ms. Bayer said no, this was a completely different topic under Welfare Reform. The food stamp program is still an entitlement program.

The AFDC program has been blocked and capped. What is nationally known as JOBS, is called GAIN in California. AFDC, GAIN and the Emergency Assistance Funds which were separate entitlement funds have been combined and capped. There are new opportunities for Welfare innovation present in the combination of these programs, if they are handled properly. The State and County must form a new partnership to deal with the changes in the system. Los Angeles County is 40% of the Welfare caseload statewide. It is important to be a part of the design process of these new programs.

Chairperson Buerk asked who was working with the State from Los Angeles County on the new plan. Ms. Bayer replied that a task force has been formed at the request of the Board of Supervisors which consists of: Department of Health Services, Mark Finucane; Children and Family Services, Peter Degree; CAO, David Janssen; Mental Health, Areta Caskell; Probation, Barry Nidorf, Community and Senior Services, Stephanie Kopfleisch; Community Development Commission, Carlos Jackson and herself.

Commissioner Barger stated that traditionally Los Angeles County encounters problem with Sacramento and asked how this would affect the County's situation. Ms. Bayer replied that this relationship is something the task force is trying to change. The task force is attempting to approach Sacramento with the unanimous support of all the Supervisors. Since the State has been given all the decision making power, it is important for the County to have the unanimous, bi-partisan support of the Board on any policy issues relating to Welfare Reform.

Chairperson Buerk asked if the changes taking place require legislative or administrative action. Ms. Bayer replied that it was a mixture of both. Chairperson Buerk asked Ms. Bayer to categorize the actions. Ms. Bayer replied that was not possible due to varied nature of the required actions and the conflicts that exist in the Federal Bill. They are currently identifying what can be changed by legislation, executive order, etc.

Commissioner Hill asked how this new partnership of the State and County will effect the local responsibilities of communities and individuals. Ms. Bayer replied that the County can no longer be seen as the sole provider for Welfare. The ownership of welfare must be shared, as stated in the Legislative Policy. The community has to participate as well: the business community, the school, non-

profit and for profit organizations, and city governments.

Commissioner Stoke noted that in the Policy Legislation recommendations, the Federal Government is not included as a partner in the scope of work. They should be identified to accept some responsibility for acting as sponsor for the immigrants it is abandoning.

Chairperson Buerk asked why Los Angeles County should administer the money for welfare that is given to the County by the State or Federal governments. Why is it not administered by those branches of government? Ms. Bayer replied that the Federal government has basically gotten out of the business of Welfare and has moved everything over to the states and granted them great authority and independence in designing their programs. Many states do operate the program directly. The State of California and several other states have chosen to use their counties, which are created by the state. Welfare Reform allows the states to do anything they want in administering welfare. The State of Texas is putting it out to bid to private companies. Some states are giving counties the first right to refusal and then they put it out to bid. The states' possibilities of administration of welfare are wide open.

Chairperson Buerk asked if the State of California has already determined how it will handle the administration of Welfare Reform. Ms. Bayer replied that the State has submitted its plan to the Federal Government in order to get more funding. This plan states that the State will continue to operate the way it has been operating. The Federal Government used 1995 as a base year for funding. This was a particular high case year and case volume has dropped allowing more money to be available. This interim plan allowed them to garner \$200 million which would have been left on the table. The Governor will unveil his plan in January. The legislature, also a major player, will be releasing its plan as well. David Janssen, Ms. Bayer, and Burt Margolin, the Legislative Strategist who helped the Health Dept. in the 1115 waiver, are very focused in making the County viable in these proceedings. Chairperson Buerk asked if Mr. Margolin was the primary person speaking for the County in Sacramento. Ms. Bayer replied it was Mr. Margolin and Cliff Allenboughy.

Commissioner Petak asked if the additional \$200 million was due to the case load decreasing. Ms. Bayer replied yes. Commissioner Petak asked why the case load decreased. Ms. Bayer replied that our economy is doing well and supporting more people. Commissioner Petak asked when the block grant would be adjusted in the future. Ms. Bayer said she was unsure. Commissioner Petak stated that it must be adjusted according to the caseload, otherwise you would acquire a large windfall if your caseload continued to decrease. Ms. Bayer replied that it is difficult to predict what will happen when there is another recession and the grants don't equal the need. Commissioner Petak that the County will be in great trouble if the caseload, and consequently block grants, continue to decrease, then we hit a recession and the government is using the previous year's caseload as a base. He asked if the legislation dealt with that issue. Ms. Bayer replied that was something she would have to check on. Of the windfall, Governor Wilson has said that \$60 million will go to the GAIN program. For L.A. County that is about \$20-\$28 million.

Commissioner Barger asked if Ms. Bayer was getting the cooperation of the California Delegation, the House, the Assembly and the Senate. Ms. Bayer replied that they are working on creating a concerted effort. Is important to have the legislative delegation speak with one voice, as well as the Board.

Commissioner Stoke commented that the Economy and Efficiency Commission could serve as an observer and not a participant in the DPSS program, so that when called upon by the Board, the Commission would be more able to act.

Commissioner Abel commented that the phrase "unintended consequences" has been used frequently in relation to the State and local relationship. He feels it will be used frequently to describe the effects of Welfare Reform. He believes that the Commission either needs to take the necessary time and efforts to fully participate in DPSS's reform challenges, or the Commission should stay out of the process.

Commissioner Glushon asked if AFDC checks are being offered on-line yet. Ms. Bayer replied that, currently, every welfare recipient receives their food stamps on-line at a check cashing facility. General Relief recipients also receive their assistance checks at these facilities rather than through the mail. There is approval from the Federal Government to have AFDC checks issued this way as well. The on-line feature alleviates problems of crimes against postal workers that were related to the delivery of assistance checks. Also, the County's bank, Wells Fargo, was having difficulty with supporting the influx of checks on the first of each month. The County is staggering the checks so not all recipients will receive their assistance on the same day. Commissioner Glushon asked how this would affect rent due dates. Ms. Bayer replied that they are working with Section 8 owners and other landlords to

accommodate the staggering, but if it is not possible, the recipient just has to declare a hardship and they will continue to receive their check on the first. Commissioner Glushon asked if the number of facilities where the recipients could cash their checks has been limited. In the past they were able to cash their check at any bank. Ms. Bayer replied that there are 44 outlets where checks can be cashed. They are looking to expand and franchise but the State said it must be competitively bid, which will take some time. This is also an interim situation, Welfare Reform, has everyone moving to Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) by 2002.

Commissioner Jimenez asked how the changes would effect the DPSS workforce. Ms. Bayer replied that Welfare Reform completely changes the relationship between clients and workforce. Currently, the product is a check. The check is the only reason the client comes to the office. The workforce's job is to make sure it is the correct amount for the correct person. With Welfare Reform, the client is coming to the employee to find out how to get off and stay off of welfare. The employee's job will be centered on helping the client to achieve self sufficiency. Commissioner Jimenez and Chairperson Buerk asked how this would effect the size of the DPSS workforce. Ms. Bayer replied that she is unsure at this point. Commissioner Petak commented that DPSS is faced with a huge re-training effort for their employees. Ms. Bayer agreed.

Commissioner Petak asked what role, if any should the Commission play at this point in time in regards to the challenges DPSS faces. Ms. Bayer replied that Commissioner Abel had a very good point earlier about fully participating or staying out of the process, and this is an involvement issue the Commission should discuss. Chairperson Buerk stated that the Board asked the Commission to examine DPSS before Welfare Reform was enacted. Although the Department Head was in the process of leaving, it was assumed that the function of the department would stay the same. When the function radically changed, our project was put on hold. Currently there is the task force, which Ms. Bayer chairs, the Legislative Analyst, and the Board working on the reform process. He feels the Commission is not fast enough in its reaction time, which normally takes six months, to have meaningful input. What is needed is immediate input to resolve the reform issues. Once that is in place and Board still feels the Commission should review how the department functions and is organized, then we could work on those issues. This is further in the future than was anticipated. Chairperson Buerk stated that we should inform the Board of our decision.

Commissioner Balderrama thanked Ms. Bayer for her efforts and dedication to finding solutions for Welfare Reform. He is aware that some abuse the system, but there are many with no spouse and no job who need the help of the system.

Commissioner Hammond asked if there were any studies that showed possible impacts, especially on crime, of Welfare Reform in the next five years. Ms. Bayer replied that the Manpower Development Resource Center (MDRC), an organization out of Washington D.C. that evaluates social service programs, is doing a study. They will be evaluating neighborhoods in L.A. County over a 5 year period to view the impact on all aspects of the community. RAND is also interested in doing a study on General Relief. Mark Finucane suggested that they comprise a committee to examine the requests for studies. Dean Schniederman is on the DPSS Commission and he is interested in setting up a committee for this purpose. Ms. Bayer is supportive of this.

Chairperson Buerk thanked Ms. Bayer for presentation and the insight she provided. Ms. Bayer offered to come back in the future to brief the Commission on DPSS's status and stated that she would see that the Commission was invited to participate in forums and conferences that focus on Welfare Reform.

## **V. OLD BUSINESS (CONTINUED)**

### **4. Delivery of Municipal Services to Unincorporated Areas**

Task Force Chairperson Padilla reported that Supervisor Burke made a motion to have the CAO's office study the Commission's Unincorporated Areas report. The CAO's study is expected in the next few months.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Amendment to Bylaws of the Commission [click here to view proposed bylaws](#)**

Commissioner Jimenez introduced a bylaw amendment proposing a new method of selecting a Chair of the Commission. He suggests a nominating committee comprised of one person from each district who will take the nominations for Chair and propose them to the entire Commission. His other proposed

change to the current method is the voice-vote to a show of hands. He feels that this is a method that allows for more participation from the entire Commission and is in line with the method currently used by most other commissions and committees.

Commissioner Barger asked if the nominations were restricted to one person from each district. Commissioner Jimenez replied that there could be multiple nominations from each district.

Commissioner Stoke stated he believes that the Commission has functioned very well under its current method and he does not understand the motivation to change the procedure. He feels that the nominating committee comprised of district representatives will politicize the process. The Commission has always operated in a nonpartisan manner. He feels that the structure of the Commission should only be changed by the Board.

Commissioner Petak asked if this would change the selection of the Vice-Chair. Commissioner Jimenez replied no, the Vice-Chair would still be selected by the Chair.

Commissioner Jimenez stated that, in response to Commissioner Stoke's comments, the Commission's bylaws allow for the Commission to decide the manner in which it chooses officers. He is proposing to amend the bylaws, not change the structure of the Commission.

Commissioner Glushon commented that most of the Commissioners on the Commission have served on other commissions for the city, county, etc. In his experience, the changes proposed by Commissioner Jimenez are in line with the procedures followed by other like organizations. He does not feel that the nominating committee will politicize the process. Commissioner Glushon feels the coin-toss should be eliminated. In an effort to protect the process of determining the leadership of the Commission, we should concentrate on consensus.

Commissioner Fuhrman voiced his support for the motion. Commissioner Frankel added that she supported the nominating committee idea. Commissioner Sylva stated she supported the motion but wanted to ask Commissioner Jimenez to amend his motion so candidates could still be nominated from the floor on the day of the election.

Commissioner Seidner asked if there was a term limit for service as the Chair. Chairperson Buerk replied no.

Commissioner Glushon moved to amend the motion by moving the beginning statement of Section B, concerning nominations from the floor, to the end of Section B and change the word "shall" to "may". Strike part of Section C, 2 and all of Section C, 3 which contains the "coin toss" language. Commissioner Jimenez accepted the amendments.

Commissioner Seidner stated that he feels that the Commission should consider term limits for the Chair and asked if this was an appropriate amendment to this motion. Mr. Staniforth informed him that this was not an area covered by the section Commissioner Jimenez proposes to amend and, due to the Commission bylaws, any changes to the bylaws must be submitted in writing at the meeting one month prior to voting on the motion. Chairperson Buerk stated it would be added to December's agenda and Commissioner Seidner should prepare a specific motion for that meeting.

Moved and seconded that the Commission revise Section 5, Election Procedures, of its Operating Procedures as amended by the maker. Motion carried on a 16 to 1 vote, with Commissioner Stoke voting against the motion.

Section 5., Election Procedures now reads as follows:

Section 5. Election Procedures Commission officers shall be selected in the following manner:

- A. There shall be no secret ballots or absentee voting (Government Code, 54953)
- B. Candidates may be nominated by a Committee composed of five Commissioners, one representing each supervisorial district. The committee member representing each supervisorial district shall be selected by the four commissioners appointed by that supervisor.



Candidates may be nominated from the floor at the election meeting.

1. Those commissioners serving on the Nominating Committee will be disqualified from becoming a candidate in the election for Chair.

C. The election will be held by a show of hands at the election meeting subject to the following:

1. If one of the candidates receives a majority of all votes cast, he/she will be declared the winner.

2. If there are three or more candidates and no one receives a majority of all votes cast, a run-off election between the two candidates with the highest number of votes will be held. The run-off shall be conducted by a show of hands at the election.

## **2. Funding of the Commission**

Chairperson Buerk stated that the Commission has no budget other than that for the salary of the Executive Director. When money is needed for projects or to renew the Executive Director's contract, the Commission must go to the Board to request funds. The Commission needs to discuss if it wants to: 1) continue operating under these circumstances 2) approach the Board for an operating budget or 3) raise funds on its own. When Chairperson Buerk started on the Commission, they had the ability to raise funds. This ability was taken away when the Commission still had a budget. Currently, we have no budget and no outside funding. We can only take on projects that the Board decides to fund.

Commissioner Glushon suggested that, due to the importance of this subject and the late hour, that this discussion be placed on December's agenda before Old Business. Chairperson Buerk agreed and asked each Commissioner to carefully consider the funding issue.

Commissioner Barger asked to have the three alternatives circulated to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Abel stated that Chairperson Buerk had appointed a committee from the Executive Committee to look into funding and they should also add to their findings to December's discussion.

Commissioner Abel asked how the motion that was earlier passed concerning the nominating process would be implemented. Chairperson Buerk stated that he and Mr. Staniforth would facilitate the matter.

Commissioner Fuhrman stated that he had prepared a draft proposal concerning Civil Service which he will fax to Commissioners Frankel, Barger and any other interested Commissioners. He asked that the matter be placed on December's agenda.

Commissioner Fuhrman stated that a few months ago the Commission decided to remove Commissioner Vera from the Commission and he expressed concern over Commissioner absences that might fall under the same criteria for dismissal. He asked the Chair to examine this possibility. He suggests this only to insure that all Commissioners are treated equally. Chairperson Buerk replied that he would review the absences record.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion from the floor, Chairman Buerk adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Bruce J. Staniforth  
Executive Director

[Go to November 6, 1996 Agenda](#)

[Return to December 4, 1996 Agenda](#)



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 163, 500 West Temple St.,  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Phone (213) 974-1491 FAX (213) 620-1437 [E-Mail EEComm@co.la.ca.us](mailto:EEComm@co.la.ca.us)  
WEB [eec.co.la.ca.us](http://eec.co.la.ca.us)