

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

ROOM 139, HALL OF ADMINISTRATION / 500 WEST TEMPLE / LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 / 625-3611, Ext. 64805

M I N U T E S

FULL COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: Friday, October 17, 1969
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Hall of Administration

Members Present:

Robert Mitchell, Chairman
Dr. John Bollens
Davis Brabant
John Byork
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Harlan Loud
P. S. Magruder
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Irvin Mazzei
L. E. McKee
Ferdinand Mendenhall
George Shellenberger
Mrs. Benjamin Erick Smith
Gus A. Walker

Members Absent:

Raymond Arbuthnot
Maurice Rene Chez
Roc Cutri
Dr. Warren Jones
Louis Rogers
William Torrence

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

Mr. Mitchell called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. He commended the committee members for their attendance and interest, particularly at the recent meetings in which the committee has moved into the study of the County Charter. He said that the committee will hear from qualified experts, but that committee members will withhold their personal opinions until the committee has gathered the information it needs from the invited experts.

Mr. Mitchell introduced Miss Earnestine Middleton who is acting for the committee's regular secretary Miss Maxlynn Larsen while she is on vacation. He then asked Dr. Bollens to lead the committee's discussion.

Dr. Bollens said first that Mr. William MacDougall, General Counsel and Manager of the County Supervisors' Association of California had agreed to appear before the committee as its second invited guest. The date had been tentatively set for Wednesday, October 29th, 9:30 a.m.

Dr. Bollens said that there are three items on the agenda for committee discussion in relation to the County Charter study. The first was an "Information Report on the Authority and Responsibility of the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer in Los Angeles County." This report was passed out to the members. He then asked Mr. Roche to review the report orally.

Mr. Roche explained that the report was background information for the committee's study. The first section of the report covered the pertinent passages in the County Charter which indicate the responsibility of the Board of Supervisors to supervise department heads directly. The Board of Supervisors is

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 17, 1969

Page 2

both the legislative and executive head of the County. The County Charter prescribes certain department heads that the Board must appoint, but it does not prescribe all of them that are now in the County organization. There is no mention in the County Charter of the chief administrative officer. His position and certain other department positions not mentioned in the Charter have been established by Board Ordinance and are described in the Administrative Code, the official collection of Board Ordinances.

The description of the duties and authority of the chief administrative officer are thus outlined in the Administrative Code. The report pointed out that there is considerable ambiguity between the Administrative Code and the County Charter relative to the authority of the chief administrative officer. Although the Administrative Code, in referring to the chief administrative officer, uses the phrase "departments, services, institutions or districts under his supervision," in actual fact, the Board is the direct supervisor of the department heads.

Mr. Roche said the last section of the report quotes from the committee's previous report on County Organization, which was issued in 1966. That report delineates some of these problems and some of these ambiguities.

Dr. Bollens commented that even if the committee went along with the existing system, there is some work to be done in clarifying the language of the Charter and the Administrative Code to bring them into harmony. He said, however, that the language in the Administrative Code is fairly typical of what is found in California counties that have chief administrative officers.

Mr. Mitchell then asked that copies of the excerpt from the Musto report on "Alternative Forms of County Government" be passed out to committee members.

Dr. Bollens explained that this report was prepared by the New Jersey County and Municipal Government Study Commission. The full report is called "County Government: Challenge and Change." He said the Commission was a state-wide Commission established by the New Jersey State Legislature with a rather sizeable research staff. William Musto was the Chairman. Dr. Bollens said the report analyzes four alternative forms of county government. It recommended that one of these forms be adopted by each New Jersey county as determined by each county. The first alternative, the elected executive plan, also includes the position of a chief administrator appointed by the elected executive. Form two, the strong manager plan, provides for an appointed official as a chief executive. He appoints and dismisses all county employees and "directs and supervises the administration of all county departments, offices, and agencies." Form three is called the elected supervisor plan. The electorate elects at large the chairman of the board of supervisors, or freeholders as they are called in New Jersey, who is called supervisor. He is considered the official head of the government. This form also provides for an appointed county administrator selected by a majority vote of the board of freeholders. He appoints and dismisses department heads with the approval of the majority of the board.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 17, 1969

Page 3

The last alternative, the board president plan, provides for the selection of the board chairman by a majority of the board, similar to the system in Los Angeles County. It also includes the position of county administrator, again with authority to appoint and dismiss department heads with approval of a majority of the board.

Mr. Roche pointed out that in this fourth form, the county administrator still has more executive authority than the chief administrative officer of Los Angeles County since he appoints and dismisses department heads with the approval of the Board. Also the New Jersey Commission recommends only these four forms. It does not recommend a chief administrative officer system.

Dr. Bollens said that, in a relatively few pages, the report presents quite significant material that would be helpful to the committee in its future deliberations and in questioning the guest speakers. The report is a current one since it was issued in April 28, 1968.

Dr. Bollens said that Mr. Roche and he had reviewed the transcript of Mr. Hillenbrand's presentation. He said he would summarize what he felt were the most important points as a basis for discussion by the committee.

Dr. Bollens said that Mr. Hillenbrand stressed the need in counties for executive leadership to meet expanding responsibilities. He said counties should separate the executive and legislative functions. He advocated the merits of an elected chief executive officer coupled with a professional chief administrator. Mr. Hillenbrand emphasized the quality of the elected executives who now hold that position. He favored the exemption of department heads from civil service because they are policy makers, and therefore, should be exempt just as their counterparts are exempt at the national level of government.

As to the size of the governing board, he said it should be small enough to operate effectively; but it should not be so small that it could not provide effective representation of the people. He concluded by saying that there was a very strong need in America to strengthen local government and to make it increasingly responsible.

Mr. Mitchell said that regardless of whether we agree with Mr. Hillenbrand or not, he is an authority, and it is the committee's purpose to listen to these various authorities covering the whole spectrum of thought. The committee will then devote all the time it needs to develop its own conclusions.

Mr. Mazzei asked if the committee could have a court stenographer at the meetings who could then prepare a transcript and send it immediately out to committee members. He said it was impossible for the committee's secretary to do all this work. Mr. Roche agreed and said that he had discussed this matter with Mr. Mize, Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors, who recommended that the committee use a court reporter who would be hired by contract.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 17, 1969

Page 4

Mr. Loud asked if it would be advantageous to have a summary of how the present system developed and the general background on the development of the chief administrative office.

Mr. Harry Hufford, Chief of the Budget Division in the Chief Administrative Office who was attending the meeting, said there was material available which could be updated to answer these questions. He said that the chief administrative office was established in 1938. Before that there had been a strong auditor who functioned in a similar capacity.

The committee concluded that a formal motion should be made to request a court stenographer. Mr. Mazzei made the motion, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. Mitchell then asked Dr. Bollens to review again the speakers who are scheduled to appear before the committee. Dr. Bollens said that Mr. Hillenbrand had been invited to present the national picture. The next speaker, Mr. MacDougall, comes from a California background and will give the committee the State point of view. Following these two speakers, the task force thought the committee should hear a county manager from another area in California. It has selected Mr. M. D. Tarshes who is the County Manager of San Mateo County. He has been county manager in two different counties, Sacramento and San Mateo, and for a long time he was a member of the staff of the chief administrative officer in San Diego County.

Next, the plan is to hear Mr. John Spellman, the newly elected County Executive of King County, Washington. He should be an interesting person to hear, because he formerly was a member of the county governing board. Dr. Bollens said that he was hopeful that at the same meeting Mr. Richard Albrecht, who served as the chairman of the board of freeholders, which drew up the new King County Charter, will appear with Mr. Spellman. He can tell the committee his experience with charter reform.

The next speaker is a county manager, Carl Johnson, who was recently appointed county manager in Sacramento County. He has served as county manager in counties in four different states.

Finally, the committee will hear from another elected executive out of the area. On the list is Lawrence Roos, who is the elected executive, called supervisor, of St. Louis County, Missouri. Roos has operated under two different charters, one of which has just gone into effect. He was a prominent business man and a Republican candidate for Governor last year.

After these speakers, Dr. Bollens said, we will probably move into the local scene to hear from local people and various elements of the public that want to be heard.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 17, 1969

Page 5

Mr. Magruder stated that he feels the committee needs information on specific cases, rather than general philosophy. The committee should hear speakers who will cite cases and who will tell us what the past organization and circumstances had been which brought about the desire for change.

Mr. Mazzei said that, inasmuch as the committee is an economy and efficiency committee, would it not be advisable to also bring in experts from out of the state where they have had both forms of government and could give the committee a "before and after" financial analysis of the cost of each form and its efficiency. He said he meant a cost comparison between an appointed executive form and an elected executive form. How, for example, was the tax rate affected?

Dr. Bollens replied that the committee could invite people who would provide this type of analysis specifically. He said, however, that some of the six people the committee is inviting could very likely provide this type of information if the committee requests it.

Mrs. Smith asked if the committee should invite business experts who could testify about the county government from a business point of view. Dr. Bollens said that, yes, it is the committee's intention to bring in local people from both the business and labor fields.

There being no further business, Mr. Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.