

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY
CITIZENS ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION**

ROOM 139, HALL OF ADMINISTRATION / 500 WEST TEMPLE / LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 / 974-1491

M I N U T E S

FULL COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, December 5, 1973
PLACE: Hall of Administration, Room 864

Members Present:

Maurice Chez, Chairman
George Bodle
John Byork
James Cunningham
Roc Cutri
Dr. Robert Downey
Jerry Epstein
Milton Gordon
Catie Graeffe
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Joe Lederman
Harlan Loud
Leo Majich
W. J. Moreland
George Shellenberger

Members Absent:

Ferdinand Mendenhall
William Mortensen
Robert Ruchti

Maurice Rene Chez
Chairman

George E. Bodle
John D. Byork
James J. Cunningham
Roc Cutri
Jerry Epstein
Milton G. Gordon
Dixon R. Harwin
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Joseph A. Lederman
Harlan G. Loud
Leo A. Majich
Ferdinand Mendenhall
Robert A. Olin
George Shellenberger
William Torrence

Burke Roche
Executive Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. Mr. Chez introduced new Commissioner W. J. Moreland, who was appointed by Supervisor Schabarum to replace Robert Olin. Mr. Moreland is the Assistant to the President of Conrac Corporation, a diversified instrument, machine tool and electronics company.

Mr. Luke Heese, staff specialist replacing Richard Hancsak, was introduced and welcomed to the staff of the commission. Mr. Heese is a licensed professional industrial engineer and an experienced systems analyst.

Mr. Chez said that the members had been mailed copies of the report on civil service and collective bargaining, and the purpose of this meeting was to formally present it to the commission for approval. He turned the meeting over to Harlan Loud, Chairman of the Civil Service-Employee Relations Task Force.

Mr. Loud named the members of the task force--George E. Bodle, Milton G. Gordon, Mrs. Ray Kidd, Joseph A. Lederman, William S. Mortensen, and Robert Ruchti. He expressed his appreciation and thanks to them for the hard work and the time spent on this complex study. He said that Mr. Chez had also worked very diligently, had attended all task force meetings, many of the coordination meetings, and had kept the Board of Supervisors advised of the progress of the report. He said that the task force had not agreed 100 percent on every issue, but that the report, in its final form, had been approved unanimously for presentation to the full commission.

E & E COMMISSION MINUTES

December 5, 1973

Page 2

Mr. Loud read some selected paragraphs from the report as a preface to his presentation. He concluded by saying that the task force was now asking that the commission approve the report for presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Chez called for questions and discussion on the report.

The following questions were asked and answered:

Mr. Cunningham asked what the points of disagreement were among the task force members. Mr. Loud said that the deletion of the prevailing wage clause was one of them. Some members weren't in complete agreement but felt that the final decision should be made by the voters.

Mr. Gordon added that the report represents a consensus by the task force. It agreed on the basics of the report and the approach, which doesn't necessarily mean that each one of the members subscribed to a line by line endorsement.

Mr. Shellenberger said that he agreed 100 percent with the second to last paragraph on page 70, namely, that government employees who perform effectively and responsibly should be rewarded and promoted. Those who perform poorly should be disciplined or discharged.

Mr. Cutri asked how the two commissions felt about the combined commission. Mr. Chez said that both commissions had a chance for input. He said that the Employee Relations Commission seemed to be in agreement with the report. He could not say the same for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Roche added that the Employee Relations Commissioners had asked that their comments be kept confidential. Because of this premise, no statement could be made about their attitudes on any particular part of the report. However, he said he would like to say that they were extremely positive and helpful.

Miss Graeffe referred to the statement about the low morale of County management. She asked if they had found any particular reason for this. Mr. Chez answered that middle management was on the same pay plan and received the same benefits as the rank and file employees. The rank and file employees were represented by the unions; management felt that there was no one representing them. This was the reason they were now organizing and joining unions of their own. Some incentive had to be given to management so it would act like management.

Mr. Majich said that the Road Department and the Flood Control District tend to follow the wages and fringe benefits of the construction industry. He asked what would happen when the prevailing wage clause was deleted and the unions relied strictly on the negotiating process. Mr. Chez answered that it would be naive for anyone to think that the unions would go to the bargaining table without first getting all the information and facts available in order to strengthen their bargaining position. If the scope of bargaining is broadened, then the task force felt that it must recommend deletion of the prevailing wage clause.

E & E COMMISSION MINUTES

December 5, 1973

Page 3

Mr. Gordon added that he thought the prevailing wage clause was a tempest in a teapot. No union leader is going to negotiate for less than the prevailing wage. Mr. Roche agreed that the task force analysis is that this issue tends to be much more emotional than substantive.

Mr. Cutri asked if the duties of the Director of Personnel would be different under the Board of Supervisors than they are now under the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Roche said that there would be no significant difference. The Civil Service Commission is now required to approve all actions by the Director of Personnel. The new commission would be taken out of this routine role of approval of the actions of the Personnel Department. Employees will be able to go to the new commission with grievance and appeal procedures if the Personnel Department abuses its authority. Unlike the Civil Service Commission, the new commission will be purely regulatory and appellate. It no longer will function in an executive and administrative capacity.

There being no more questions, Mr. Loud moved that the report, as prepared, be approved for presentation to the Board of Supervisors. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shellenberger and passed unanimously.

Mr. Gordon said that the task force and the staff had been complimented and thanked, and he would like to speak for all the task force members and thank Mr. Loud, the Chairman of the task force, who presided over the meetings with such courtesy and wise discernment.

Mr. Chez said he would like to add his thanks to Mr. Loud. He also complimented Mr. Roche and Miss Larsen for their efforts in preparing the report.

Mr. Chez asked all members to try to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting on December 11, when he would formally present the report to the Board. He wished everyone a wonderful and happy holiday and adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.