

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

ROOM 139, HALL OF ADMINISTRATION / 500 WEST TEMPLE / LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 / 625-3611, Ext. 64605

M I N U T E S

FULL COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, March 19, 1969

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: Hall of Administration, Room 864

Robert Mitchell,
Chairman
Raymond Arbuthnot
Dr. John C. Bollens
Davis Brabant
Max Candiotty
Maurice Rene Chez
Dr. Warren S. Jones
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Harlan G. Loud
P. S. Magruder
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Irvin Mazzei
L. E. McKee
Ferdinand Mendenhall
Louis Rogers
George Shellenberger
Mrs. Benjamin Erick Smith
William Torrence
Gus A. Walker
Burke Roche,
Executive Secretary

Members Present:

Robert Mitchell, Chairman
Davis Brabant
Harlan G. Loud
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Irvin Mazzei
L. E. McKee
Ferdinand Mendenhall
Louis Rogers
George Shellenberger
William Torrence
Gus Walker

Members Absent:

Raymond Arbuthnot
Dr. John C. Bollens
Max Candiotty
Maurice Rene Chez
Dr. Warren S. Jones
Mrs. Ray Kidd
P. S. Magruder
Mrs. Benjamin Erick Smith

Others Present:

Gordon T. Nesvig, Director of Personnel
Robert L. Leonetti, Deputy Director,
Classification and Compensation

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Mitchell at 9:35 a.m. He introduced Mr. Louis Rogers, new member of the committee appointed by Supervisor Hahn.

Mr. Gordon Nesvig, Director of Personnel, and Mr. Robert Leonetti, Deputy Director, Classification and Compensation were introduced by Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Nesvig reported on the progress of the Employee Relations Commission. He reported that as they get into negotiations with the different employee groups, they find they must have a unified classification of all employees. At the present time there are over 60,000 employees and over 2,000 classifications working under a system that has not been updated for 30 years.

Mr. Nesvig referred to the committee's previous reports to the Board of Supervisors in which the committee recommended a study be made of the County classification and compensation procedures covering all employees. At that time, the committee had recommended postponing the study until the new personnel organization is established and operating smoothly. He also referred to the Chief Administrative Officer's letter of November 22, 1966, stating that the County should employ an outside management consulting firm after the Charter Amendment becomes effective. The Charter Amendment is now in effect, and he and Mr. Leonetti are recommending the firm of J. L. Jacobs to do the study. He asked the committee to support their recommendation when they present it to the Board of Supervisors.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 19, 1969

Page 2

Mr. Nesvig further stated that they have contacted most of the employee organizations and think most of them will go along. They are filing the letter this date, and the request should go to the Board of Supervisors next Tuesday. They will appreciate any support the committee can give them.

In answer to questions from committee members regarding the selection of this particular firm, Mr. Nesvig said they had chosen this firm because they specialize in municipal and county work; they have been doing work for the City of Los Angeles and whatever information they have gathered for the City will be available to the County when they have completed their study. The County is getting a better per-capita price than the City.

Mr. Leonetti described the type of study that would be made by the Jacobs firm. Mr. Rogers asked if they were requesting the committee to recommend a firm? Mr. Nesvig answered no; they have chosen the Jacobs firm for the job.

After a discussion as to whether or not the committee should go on record as approving the selection of J. L. Jacobs' firm, Mr. Mazzei stated that it was his opinion it was not the committee's responsibility to recommend any firm or to ever enter into a position where it approved or disapproved anyone. He felt the only responsibility of the committee's was to re-affirm the recommendations made to the board in their previous reports.

Mr. Nesvig said he thought the statement was a good one, and if the committee wished more information on the firm, they would be happy to supply it.

Motion by Mr. Mazzei, seconded by Mr. Brabant, the committee reiterate its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and remind them that they adopted these recommendations. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Roche read the recommendations from the previous report for the benefit of the new committee members.

Mr. Nesvig and Mr. Leonetti left the meeting and Mr. Mitchell called a recess at 10:05 a.m.

Meeting reconvened at 10:11. Mr. Roche read the letter addressed to the Board of Supervisors regarding the Architectural Services report. There had been one change made in the letter since copies had been mailed to the members.

Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Roche if April 8th had been definitely fixed as the date for presentation of the report to the board. Mr. Roche said he had talked to the Supervisors and they believed this to be a fine date.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there were any objections to the letter as it was now written. There were none.

Mr. Roche reported that the AIA issued a news release recommending strong support of the Architectural Services Report. The Chamber of Commerce has to go through its Board of Directors before taking a position on the report. He then read a letter from the American Institute of Building Design which had been sent to the Board of Supervisors. It was opposed to the report, and Mr. Roche pointed out the discrepancies in the letter.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 19, 1969

Page 3

Mr. Mazzei referred to the letter Mr. Roche had sent to each member of the committee advising them of Mr. Hollinger's stand on the Architectural Services Report. Mr. Mazzei stated that he thought from now on the committee should evaluate more carefully any study it makes. If the board is going to refer their findings to a man who opposes any change, then the committee is wasting its time.

Mr. Rogers thought the committee should at least be given some valid reason for referral of the report. Mr. Mendenhall said he agreed entirely, and asked what good the committee could do if they had to fight department heads.

Mr. Roche was asked on what grounds Mr. Hollinger was opposing the report. Mr. Roche said we would have to wait for him to submit his report to the board before we could find out, but his basic position seems to be that he thinks the present system is adequate.

Mr. Loud said, as a member of the 1966 Grand Jury that criticized the County's architectural selection system, he felt that Mr. Hollinger's statement was motivated by one of the supervisors. He thought the committee should have been advised of Mr. Hollinger's feelings before this time.

Mr. Torrence stated that the committee couldn't be governed by Mr. Hollinger's feelings; they couldn't do just what he wanted them to do.

Mr. Roche mentioned the past battles the committee had over some of its reports and the strong feelings they caused among some groups. He reminded the members that they would have to recognize that anything the committee did would be controversial.

Mr. Brabant said he agreed with Mr. Mazzei. If the committee is being used, then he is going to be more than slightly vociferous. He is willing to serve on the committee as long as the committee functions. The fact that the report was referred to Mr. Hollinger is disturbing, but he is not jumping to conclusions.

After a brief discussion regarding the best time for presentation of the report, the time of 9:30 a.m. was set. Mr. Mitchell will be speaking on behalf of the committee.

Mr. Roche said the Chamber of Commerce will have a representative there, and the AIA expects to have the Presidents of each of the three Chapters speak at the presentation. The 1966 Grand Jury is also interested and will probably have a report. The American Institute of Building Design would probably speak against the report. The ARA was disappointed because they had not been included in the nomination process and it is not known what position the Board of Directors will take.

Mr. Mitchell voiced the opinion that it would probably be easier to get the report adopted if the ARA had been included.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 19, 1969

Page 4

Discussion followed on the reasons why the ARA had not been included, and whether or not it would be advisable to include them now. Mr. Rogers stated that in discussing the report with the supervisors the fact that the ARA was not included seemed to be their only reason for opposing it. He asked if he would be out of order to suggest that the report be changed to include them.

Mr. Torrence thought it would be out of order because the report had already been adopted.

Mr. Brabant explained how the subcommittee had arrived at the decision of how to select the nominating board. The intention was not primarily to pass the work around to more architects, but to get competent architects.

Mr. Roche said that some people are using the ARA as a device to oppose the report. He doesn't feel it is so much the fact that the ARA was left out, but that the ones opposed will use every device possible to throw up a smoke screen.

Mr. Mazzei suggested that the committee add the ARA and in that way defeat the argument of those opposed. The committee agreed. Mr. Mazzei added that he thought the system should be put into effect and the board could be re-structured to include the ARA.

Mr. Brabant brought up the question as to whether this would effect the AIA. Discussion continued on the pros and cons of adding the ARA.

Mr. Mitchell advised the committee members that copies of the final report would be mailed to everyone and Mr. Roche would be furnishing copies of it to anyone interested.

Mr. Torrence moved the letter as corrected be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval; seconded by Mr. Brabant, carried unanimously.

Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Roche to report on the Sheriff-Marshal merger bill. Mr. Roche said he had been unable to get in touch with Assemblyman Schabarum so could not report on the present status of the bill. He will continue to try to contact Assemblyman Schabarum and make a report at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11 a.m.