

**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, January 30, 1974
PLACE: Hall of Administration, Room 739

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

Members Present:

Maurice Chez, Chairman
George Bodle
John Byork
James Cunningham
Milton Gordon
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Joe Lederman
Leo Majich
W. J. Moreland
George Shellenberger

Members Absent:

Roc Cutri
Dr. Robert Downey
Jerry Epstein
Catherine Graeffe
Ferdinand Mendenhall
William Mortensen
Robert Ruchti
Carl Terzian

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. Mr. Chez announced that Mr. Carl Terzian had been appointed to the commission by Supervisor Hayes to replace Dr. John Bollens. Mr. Terzian is Chairman of the Board of Carl Terzian Associates, nationally known consultants in corporate and personal public relations, governmental affairs, and economic and managerial development. He was unable to attend today's meeting because he is out of town.

Mr. Chez read the letter of resignation received from Vice Chairman of the commission, Harlan Loud, and his answer to Mr. Loud expressing regrets that he will no longer be serving on the commission.

Mr. Chez called for nominations for Vice Chairman. Mr. Shellenberger nominated Mr. Cutri; Mr. Cunningham seconded the motion. Mrs. Kidd moved that nominations be closed. Mr. Byork moved that a unanimous ballot be cast for Roc Cutri; the motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Kidd asked that the Chairman write a letter on behalf of the entire commission to Supervisors Hahn and Ward and express regrets on receiving the resignation of Harlan Loud. She asked that he call attention to Mr. Loud's service on the commission and on the Grand Jury. Members unanimously approved this suggestion, and Mr. Chez said he would be delighted to do this.

Mr. Chez asked Mr. Roche to report on the discussion regarding the Architectural Evaluation Board which took place at the Board of Supervisors' meeting the day before.

Mr. Roche said that he feels the record must be set straight regarding the operation of the Architectural Evaluation Board (AEB). A summary of his report follows:

E & E COMMISSION MINUTES

January 30, 1974

Page 2

His observation of the operation of the AEB indicates that it is operating in every detail, with perhaps only a minor exception or two, as recommended in the commission report on the selection of architects.

The report criticized the system and pointed out that seven favored architects received 64% of the contractual fees from the County over a ten-year period. Mr. Nishkian was the top one of the seven.

Since the AEB began its actual evaluation and recommendation of architects through a professional rating system, the Board of Supervisors has made 77 architectural appointments. Of these, 47 architects had never done work for the County before. The other 30, who had previous experience with the County, were appointed either (1) because they had completed their project with the County and were therefore eligible, (2) the project was a follow-on or an addition to a previous project which they had designed, or (3) they had some special qualification which justified an exception to the rule.

With respect to the article in the Los Angeles Times which stated that there had been four cases in which the County by-passed the AEB, the County reports that there were valid reasons for not using the AEB.

There also seems to be a misunderstanding with respect to the AEB system of evaluating architects. He said he would like to make it clear how the system works. Architects who wish to qualify for County work fill out the County questionnaire form, supplemented by a brochure describing their principal projects. The AEB then evaluates the capability of these architects for particular County projects. They are rated on their ability to handle a project of a particular size and also their capability to design particular types of buildings. In summary, they are rated on (1) design and planning ability, (2) staff capability, (3) technical capability, and (4) performance. This information is coded for computer use. When the County informs the AEB of a project, the AEB determines the requirements of this particular project, and the AEB then selects the architects who match these requirements. This list of qualified architects is sent to the Board of Supervisors who make the appointment from this list. There is no attempt to rate the best architect. The list simply indicates that the architects on the list are qualified to do the job. The list usually contains from four to ten architects.

The AEB is now using a performance rating of architects as part of its evaluation, per recommendation of the E & E Commission. This system was instituted this year, since the performance rating would be conducted only on architects appointed through the AEB process.

Finally, it should be emphasized that this Board has been composed of very influential citizens who have devoted a tremendous amount of their time in developing and maintaining this system; in particular, the early members, such people as Clint Ternstrom, a highly respected architect; and Robert Alshuler, President of the Metropolitan Mortgage Company and one of the appointees of the Chamber of Commerce.

E & E COMMISSION MINUTES

January 30, 1974

Page 3

Mr. Roche said there was one more point which came up at the Board of Supervisors' meeting - the question of whether the rating of these architects should be made public. He said that he was sure the AEB did not want to operate in secrecy, but if these ratings were made public, they could be misinterpreted and could create a tremendous amount of problems. Those architects who miss out on a job naturally feel the system is at fault and are ready to criticize. The question of whether or not these are public documents is before the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Chez reported that Supervisor Hahn had requested the E & E Commission to study the seven commissions having the authority to appoint department heads. He explained that the Civil Service Commission had been included with these seven commissions, but it would not be included in the study. Recommendations regarding this commission had already been made in the civil service and collective bargaining report. He asked Mr. Heese to report.

Mr. Heese said that the seven commissions named in the Board order were: Arboreta and Botanic Gardens, Business License Commission, Civil Service Commission, Human Relations Commission, Museum of Natural History, Otis Art Institute, and the Planning Commission. The Board order requested that the commission study the feasibility of transferring the authority to appoint the department head to the Board of Supervisors from the commission. In gathering information he has found several other areas which need to be included in the study. These are the authority and responsibility of the department head and the commissions themselves and a review of the functions and responsibilities of the departments. After the task force has been appointed, it can decide how to proceed with the study.

Mr. Roche said that Mr. Heese had gathered a great deal of information. He said the ordinances which established the commissions were quite vague as to what the commissions and the executives reporting to the commissions do. Another aspect for the task force to look into is the establishing of qualifications for the commissioners. At the present time there are none.

Mr. Chez appointed the members of the task force for this study. They are: Mrs. Ray Kidd, Chairman; Dr. Robert Downey, Catherine Graeffe, Joe Lederman, Bill Moreland.

Mr. Chez announced that the public hearing on the civil service and collective bargaining report had been postponed until February 28, 10 a.m., at the request of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. He reviewed the recommendations made in the report and asked all members to make every attempt to attend the meeting. He requested that notices be mailed to the members to remind them of the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.