

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

ROOM 372, 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, OCTOBER 11, 1967
TIME: 9 A.M.
PLACE: 739 - HALL OF ADMINISTRATION

Robert Mitchell,
Chairman
Raymond Arbuthnot
John C. Bollens
Davis Brabant
Max Candiotty
Maurice Rene Chez
Lynne A. Frantz
Dr. Warren S. Jones
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Harlan Loud
P. S. Magruder
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Irvin Mazzei
Maurice McAlister
Harold C. McClellan
Ferdinand Mendenhall
Earl Burns Miller
Mrs. Benjamin Erick Smith
Burke Roche,
Executive Secretary

Attendance:

Robert Mitchell, Acting Chairman
Raymond Arbuthnot
Davis Brabant
Max Candiotty
Myron J. Carr, Jr.
Harlan Loud
P. S. Magruder
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Irvin Mazzei
Ferdinand Mendenhall
Mrs. Benjamin Erick Smith
Burke Roche, Executive Secretary

Advisors:

L. S. Hollinger, Chief Administrative Officer
John Leach, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer

Guests:

Gordon Nesvig, Director of Personnel
Theodore Barry, Theodore Barry & Associates

Mr. Mitchell called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Nesvig to report on the Employee Relations Ordinance. After Mr. Nesvig's report, Mr. Mitchell thanked him for his excellent review of the progress of the ordinance to date. (Mr. Nesvig had to leave for another meeting.)

Mr. Mitchell then called on Theodore Barry to report on the Executive Compensation Study. Mr. Barry told the Committee that there are normally two systems his firm uses in evaluating jobs - the compensation factor system and the point system. He stated that he and his consultants have

encountered a very high level of suspicion regarding their study and so have had to devise a third method of evaluation called the constructive evaluation system. He and his consultants have gone to various firms in private industry and compared executives' jobs, descriptions, salaries, etc., with company heads. They have asked these company heads what a particular person in the County would be earning if he was employed by that company. In this way they have been able to gather helpful information. They are now at the point of trying to get all of this information into report form. Mr. Barry stated that using the constructive evaluation approach has given him a good foundation for a good report. He said that there will be many surprises as some 6 to 12% of the jobs have been found to be overpaid, while some of them are underpaid. He said that as soon as the material is put into report form, he will contact the Committee for a meeting and review of the report.

Mr. Barry told the Committee that a sub-committee made up of George Shellenberger, Sam Leask, and Mr. Mitchell would meet in about two weeks to go over the findings of the Barry report. The meeting will take place some time between the 17th and 23rd of October. After this meeting, a semi-final report will be presented to Mr. Hollinger and then the Personnel Department. By November 1, the final report will be ready to be presented to the Full Committee.

Mr. Mitchell told the Committee that he would be very glad to serve on the sub-committee with two such fine gentlemen as Mr. Leask and Mr. Shellenberger. He said that he would merely be sitting in on the meetings to observe.

Mr. Barry asked if any of the Committee members had questions. Mrs. Smith asked if he knew of any businesses which existed without an executive head. Mr. Barry told Mrs. Smith that this situation was not possible. She stated that the Federal Government has a President, the State has a Governor, but the County only has 5 Supervisors and a Chief Administrative Officer. Therefore, how could the County be evaluated when there is no executive head and no organization? Mr. Barry told Mrs. Smith that he felt the executive position was obviously held by Mr. Hollinger as Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Roche asked Mr. Barry about the County changes and what provisions would be allowed for this situation. Mr. Barry stated that if the job changes, the job description must change, and therefore the salary must also change.

Mr. Candiotty asked Mr. Barry how close the evaluation systems used were to one another. Mr. Barry stated that when divergence was found, he used a comparative factor system. He further stated that the low 130 jobs were found to be paid closer to the prevailing wage than the top jobs. He said there

is a wider divergence between prevailing wages in the top jobs than in the lower jobs.

Mr. Mitchell thank Mr. Barry for his report.

Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Roche to report on the campaign plans for the Sheriff-Marshal study. Mr. Roche stated that on September 28, 1967, the report and a fact sheet were sent to all the news media. He said that radio stations KNX and KLAC had presented very good editorials on the report. He told the Committee that the Marshal would be at the Board meeting on October 17, 1967, as well as Judge Smith, Chairman of the Municipal Court Judges Association, to argue against the Sheriff-Marshal report. He further stated that Mr. Mitchell and he had met with the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce which had promised its full support. The Chamber of Commerce will be releasing a statement in this regard in the very near future. Mr. Roche then told the Committee that Mr. Leach had given an excellent speech on the consolidation at the meeting of the County Commission on Judicial Procedures, October 10, 1967.

Mr. Mitchell said he felt the report was a fine one and that it spoke for itself.

Mr. Mazzei suggested that Mr. Mitchell prepare a statement to present at the October 17, Board presentation. Mr. Mitchell agreed and stated he felt something brief would be more appropriate than a long speech. He asked that all Committee members try to attend the October 17, Board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.