

MINUTES

FULL COMMISSION MEETING

MAY 1, 1991

HALL OF ADMINISTRATION, 864-A

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Gunther W. Buerk opened the meeting at 9:30 a.m.. John Campbell introduced Cathy Carr, a member of the Economy and Efficiency staff, who is assisting the Commission on gathering technical data for the Real Property Management Task Force.

William C. Waddell representing the Productivity Commission was also in attendance.

II. ATTENDANCE

The attendance list is on the last page. The absences of Commissioners Bodle, Crail, Frankel, Lowe, Lurie, Neri, and Shapiro were excused by vote of the Commissioners present.

III. OLD BUSINESS

Minutes of April 3, 1991 full Commission meeting were approved.

Task Force Status Reports:

REAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT - Randy Stockwell, Chairperson for the Real Property Management and Development Task Force announced the members of the task force who are Alfred Balderrama, Emma Fischbeck, Wally Thor, Betty Trotter, Joe Crail, Jack Drown; and Bob Lowe in an advisory capacity. Charley Kaufmann and Cathy Carr ably assist the task force. Emma Fischbeck, Wally Thor and Betty Trotter have been extremely active in the task force. Handout materials and slides were shown to illustrate the task force's presentation.

Commissioner Stockwell began his presentation with the philosophy behind the Real Property Management Task Force, that the County should efficiently manage all its real estate assets, whether owned or leased, and to the extent appropriate, get the highest and best use out of those assets. The task force has interviewed the Asset Management Division (CAO) who are working to develop several high potential properties. This group seems to be doing a good job.

On a much larger scale, the County has a wealth of real estate that may not be administered economically. The task force outlined some key issues: *Situation Analysis - Data* is deficient, which means the County doesn't have an overall property inventory to describe what properties it owns, where located, the properties' value, and the square footage of those properties. *Organization* to address real property management is fragmented. Every department manages its own real estate and, Department Managers don't have the incentive to know whether they are managing their real estate efficiently, and *alternative uses* aren't always aggressively pursued. The County has no *occupancy charge* for County owned space. Economic reality has to be injected into occupancy cost. *Space utilization* is not always efficient. There are, however, positive examples of development. For example, the Long Beach old County hospital building was turned into a commercial industrial development. This created rent and tax revenues, which benefits the County.

Los Angeles County doesn't have a complete inventory of its real estate. The Assessor has records of all public properties, but doesn't assess the value of those properties. At one time there was a program established within the Internal Services Department to identify a catalog the County's real estate. However, funding ran out and the program was discontinued. The County owns or leases approximately 52 million square feet of facility space. This data was supplied from the Space Management Unit of the Internal Services Department with some reservations, as the data is not current or accurate. Nevertheless, the task force felt it could derive some approximate property value by using this data.

The County doesn't maintain a complete inventory of how much land it owns. County owned facilities are approximately 3,575 in number with an estimated 18,366,000 in square footage. Commercial leased (office buildings) - 533 with 14,450,000 in square footage, Leased\Financed buildings - 230 with square footage of 19,200.00 and Lease-Lease backs - 17 with square footage of 400,000. These figures aren't completely accurate due to out-of-date data. Based on statistics for Los Angeles County's office rental rates in 1989, the value of owned (not including leased) properties of 18,366,000 square feet, would be approximately \$8 billion dollars. The County spent approximately \$2.4 billion dollars on owned land, buildings, construction and improvements.

The *objectives\mission* of the task force is to assist the County in better managing its owned and leased real property assets for more and better economic utilization, and to enhance the value of selected properties to generate revenue that is consistent and compatible with the public's interest and usage. The task force believes that in order for this to happen, there has to be a *board policy statement* that defines what the real property objectives are, and to assign appropriate authorities and responsibilities. A more *centralized organization* (or) *better assignment of authorities and responsibilities* to the current organization is needed. Currently the departments responsible for real estate are: the Asset Development Division in the CAO's office (currently developing downtown real estate and other high potential properties); the Community Development Commission, which seems to be doing a good job identifying selected County properties with the possibility of developing those properties, and the Internal Services Department's Real Property Branch, and also the Beaches and Harbors Department's Asset Management Bureau. Other County departments with major holdings include Public Works, Health Services, and Parks and Recreation. Questions that have been raised regarding organizational structure are: Would a more centralized organizational structure better address the County's needs in that area? Or can similar results be obtained by assignment of appropriate authorities and responsibilities to Department Managers? *Commission Thor* thinks that the manager's stature increases with the more property that he has to control. If no one tells him that he doesn't have to report to anyone regarding the cost of space he won't. Instead he will take on more and more responsibility to make himself look better.

There is no current and accurate *property inventory*, which is essential and must contain data for informed decision-making. For example: What are they currently paying for leasing instead of owning? What is the cost of the space on a fair market value basis? What would be the alternative cost for that space? *Programs\ operating procedures* should include facility rent programs for county users, there should be a *continuing review* of all property for best usage, and the *development of alternative use proposals*.

The CAO's office has instituted a Lead Tenant Program that assigns responsibility for maintenance and occupancy for each county building, and plans to install market-based rent charges for owned or leased property. This will be installed in the next fiscal year 1992-1993. The purpose of the program is to encourage departments to make economic decisions, such as seeking less costly space.

The economic rent charge would primarily be for business offices and facility space, and would exclude recreational and cultural facilities. *Commissioner Zimbalist* feels that recreational and cultural facilities shouldn't be excluded from economic rent entirely, since the CAO, and Supervisors should at least know the cost of these facilities and how much rent the County is forgoing to provide free services to the public.

The *decision process* should be done on a high level so the group making the decisions are looking out for the County's best usage, and who are willing to *review alternative use proposals* and *recommend actions* to the Board. *Incentives* should be considered to motivate departments, and possible *partial retention* of additional revenues. *John Campbell* stated that there are three different types of usage. Public usage, housing County programs, and servicing internal functions.

The task force came up with six organizational options, from current organization to highly centralized. *Commissioner Stockwell* thinks encouragement should be given to the Board to set up a real estate management policy that would include certain criteria. Conceivably a matrix that would deal with different types of owned\leased property, public property, etc. An operations manual could be composed to communicate to Department Managers how to best manage different types of property. Managers' performance could be judged on how well they deliver services, how well they manage their personnel, and also include real estate management.

Chairperson Buerk stated that he was impressed with the progress the task force has made. He also expressed interest in knowing the current value of County land, and suggested the task force take a rough statistical approach to come up with what the value of land would be today. Knowing this type of information would be helpful, and would draw attention to the fact that there is an excellent opportunity to do something with the land that would be beneficial. He also stated an example of how the City of Los Angeles recognized that in the Airport, they have tremendous assets that they are thinking of selling or leasing to yield higher revenues. The task force, in essence, is dealing with the same type of issue.

The task force plans to schedule a meeting later this month with Orange County, who seem to be on the leading edge in terms of implementing real estate management, and with other County organizations. The task force will report back at the Commission Meeting in June. *Commissioner Stockwell* believes there is a reluctance on the part of the government to deal with real estate on a business-like basis. Some policy issues that need to be addressed are in *identifying grossly under-utilized real estate* and be able to do something with it, *how to positively induce County departments to make good economic decisions related to occupancy cost, and how to assist them.*

Mr. Waddell suggested developing systems of measurement and incentives that could work in an environment of de-centralization, since a de-centralization model is much more likely to be adopted. *Commissioner Trotter* suggested that the task force focus on under utilization, and give specific examples of poor use of real estate which results in poor service to the public. *Commissioner Peever* feels that the basic issue is lack of accountability, and the opportunity issue is to better utilize assets to benefit services. There is a need to have specialized knowledge and expertise available. The question is: Where is the best place to have this knowledge and expertise? In every department on a de-centralized basis? Or a centralized basis where it can be leveraged out to various departments throughout the County? A centralized organization could generate interest and a desire to get something done, and Department Managers could be held accountable to follow the centralized guidelines and directions. *Commissioner Zimbalist* suggested managers be given some type of guidelines to make it easier to manage their property. A free market system could be created. *Commissioner Drown* feels that managers don't need incentives. Managers should be able to realize what needs to be done, and should be required to do it, and not be rewarded for doing their job. *Commissioner Balderrama* stated from his own experiences, that County warehouse space doesn't seem to be wasted. If anything more space may be needed. *Commissioner Williams* suggested that the task force take into consideration all suggestions being given and that the minutes should reflect them accordingly.

Chairperson Buerk stated that structure of ownership of real estate within the County, by department, is adverse to having much mobility and economic decision-making in terms of use. Changes can only happen if there is total expropriation from each department of all real estate. Departments should be compelled to lease or rent whatever they need, or have it assigned to them. He believes mobility is the key which should be mentioned in the report. There should be flexibility on the part of the Department Manager, so that he doesn't feel that if he gives up some space now, he will never get it back, or may not have it for future use. The manager needs to know that he can rent whenever he needs space, or that he can give up space when he doesn't need it, and that the cost savings would reflect directly in his budget. It was suggested that the task force focus on: one or two case studies where assets aren't administered properly; obtaining a "ball park" figure on the present land values; and getting examples of other agencies who have dealt with this same issue of real property management.

ECONOMY & EFFICIENCY COMMISSION ROLE\SUNSET - Robert Philibosian, Chairperson for the Economy & Efficiency Commission Role\Sunset, extended special gratitude to John Campbell for his work in assisting the task force. Along with handout materials, slides were shown. This was a preliminary report to solicit comments from the Commissioners present. If there is no disagreement on the task force report, a final report will be presented at the full Commission Meeting in June, then to the Board of Supervisors. The purpose of the task force is to decide if the *E & E Commission* should sunset or continue. The framework for the study included the *history and background* of the Commission, its *effectiveness* and the *continuing need* for the Commission. The task force arrived at three alternatives: *Sunset, Continue As Now, or Continue With Reforms*. The task force made the recommendation that the *E & E Commission continue with reforms*.

The basis for the three alternatives are as follows: Should the *E & E Commission sunset*? The Board has adequate resources in the CAO, the Grand Jury, and other County operations that can advise them. It has been some time since the Board has requested a study from the Commission, and any feasible reforms require state intervention. Recently, however, in an unanimous decision, the Supreme Court agreed with the State that Counties can charge user fees for new programs. This mandate could be one area the task force looks at for study.

Should the *Commission* continue? The Commission has plenty to offer the Board. County government operates with some financial difficulty, and the Commission is uniquely situated to assist the Board, as the Commissioners do not have any financial stakes involved in the outcome. The arguments for *continuing as now* is outweighed by the arguments for *continuing with reforms*. The Commission should be able to respond faster, be able to monitor implementation of recommendations, and improve effectiveness by assessing and discussing each project in advance. The task force believes the Commission should concentrate on high-payoff projects.

Within these purposed reforms, the task force feels very strongly that if the Commission does continue it looks at the *significance of the project*, the *feasibility*, and the *timeliness\urgency* of the project. *Project Assessment Criteria* would include *strategic scope*, *source of request*, *resources* and *county culture*. John Campbell has drafted a *Resolution*, to reflect these recommendations, which is still in the stages of revision, for the Board of Supervisors.

The task force believes individual meetings should be scheduled with each Supervisor and the CAO, and that the *E & E Commission* Chairperson along with the Supervisor's appointees, attend the meetings. The task force solicited suggestions and comments on whether or not they are on the right path, if there are additional factors that should be considered or issues that should be emphasized or de-emphasized. *Chairperson Buerk* perceives the task force as being on the right track with their preliminary report. *Commissioner Cooper* thought it would help the Commissioners if given a brief run down on what the *E & E Commission* has done through the years. *John Campbell* stated that the Commission has issued 68 major reports, which contained roughly 200 recommendations, most of which were adopted by the Board of Supervisors. During the last five years, the Commission had a pretty good success rate in getting recommendations adopted, with less success in getting them implemented. The Commission is spending approximately \$209,700 dollars per year (excluding rent).

The task force also wants to consider three issues of effectiveness: Were the recommendations adopted by the Board? If they were adopted, were they implemented? And if they were adopted and implemented, did they achieve the intended effects?

Commissioner Thor suggested sending a short monthly newsletter to the Board to keep them informed on what the Commission is doing, and how the Commission is progressing. *Commissioner Drown* stated that the question the Board may ask would concern the Commission's cost effectiveness. He feels that the Commission has done a lot of good in the past and has dug into other County departments to determine their appropriate functions.

Commissioner Zimbalist feels that one of the issues that needs to be addressed is the fact that the Commission doesn't have the Supervisors beckoning with projects, and what is the Commission qualified to do, as opposed to other Commissions or the County itself. The Internal Services Department, and probably lots of other departments, could handle minor issues. The *E & E Commission* is particularly good at handling issues that have a strategic scope and a major impact. Do the Supervisors have a list of those types of issues they want the Commission to address? And if not, does the Commission initiate projects itself? If the Commission does, is there a commitment at the top level to implement and act accordingly? These questions are a good reason to do feasibility studies prior to taking on projects. *Commissioner Zimbalist* also feels that the full Commission should contemplate changing the staffing structure from annual contracts to where the staff is paid on a project-by-project basis. This way the Commission isn't put under any pressure to keep staff busy because they are under contract for a year.

Commissioner Peever agrees that the cost effectiveness of the Commission is an issue. The County hasn't implemented a lot compared to the cost they have spent over the years. He feels the cost effectiveness issue should be an important part of the task force review in order to give the Board some sense of the cost effect payback. He also agrees with the recommendation that the *E & E Commission continue with reforms*, though he feels that some reforms have been done, to a degree, in the last two years. He feels that the Commission is an important body for the Supervisors, but that the Supervisors need to have a different attitude toward the Commission's usefulness. The Supervisors don't seem to look for the Commission to come up with important recommendations that they could sponsor and approve.

Commissioner Trotter suggested the task force look at cost avoidance and expenditures that didn't have to be made because of something the Commission recommended. For example: Because of security recommendations law suits could be avoided, and the County can save money because security is improved and liability is lessened.

Chairperson Buerk motioned that the task force final report should concentrate on the *E & E Commission continuing with reforms*. Commissioner Freitag seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously by the Commissioners present. It was also stated that the report should also focus on the issues of cost, effectiveness of recommendations, commitment by the Board of Supervisors to implement approved recommendations, and put their full power behind them. The final task force report will be presented at the full Commission Meeting in June. If any Commissioner has other information, or thoughts, or would like to sit in on the next task force meeting, their comments and/or presence would be welcomed.

Other Task Force Business:

The Blue Ribbon Commission on Children's Services had a meeting scheduled with the Board of Supervisors yesterday, but the Board delayed the meeting for two weeks. It was assumed at least three Supervisors had agreed to act on recommendations, but there was a last minute change.

IV. PRESENTATION

Sandra M. Davis, Treasurer & Tax Collector for Los Angeles County

Subject: Roles and Operations of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Department; Major Current Issues

Mrs. Davis was assisted by her Administrative Deputy, *Joanne Iwasaki*, who handed out presentation booklets, and assisted with the slide presentation. The Department of the County Treasurer was created in 1850. The County Charter was adopted in 1913, giving the Board of Supervisors the authority to appoint this position. In 1935 a Treasurer as ex-officio Tax Collector was appointed with control over both departments. The Treasurer and Tax Collector Departments were consolidated in 1966. The Department of Collections was created in 1976. The consolidation of this department with the Treasurer and Tax Collector was accomplished in 1984, and the Public Administrator was added in 1987.

The County of Los Angeles is only one of three California Counties that have an appointed Treasurer & Tax Collector. Most other Counties have this position elected. *Mrs. Davis* became Director of the Treasurer & Tax Collector Department in 1987 and has worked for the County for over twenty years.

The mission of the T & T C is to bill, collect, disburse, invest, borrow and safeguard monies and properties for the County, other governmental agencies, and private individuals as specified by law. Other services provided include enforcement, auditing, consulting, education, estate administration and public information services.

There has been a change from originally managing and collecting property taxes, to acquiring additional responsibilities of administering estates and becoming a central collection agency for the County. There has been an increase in service needs over the last few years.

The T & T C oversees a work force of approximately 863 positions and a budget with a net County cost of \$19 million dollars. The department achieves their objectives in a cost effective manner, which gave the department a net savings of \$3.2 million dollars reflected in their 1989-1990 budget. This current fiscal year's savings will be somewhat less, but the department still projects a savings. A majority of the T & T C's proposed budget is utilized for employees, services and supplies, banking or real estate. The department's main mission is to provide timely and accurate services in a manner that is fair, legal and courteous, using innovative and cost effective methods.

The department also has task forces to assist in strategic planning and evaluation. These task forces look at customer service, marketing, technology, and employee recognition and development, and is comprised of a cross section of Treasurer and Tax Collector Managers. The major areas of responsibilities focus on managing the County Treasury, borrowing and investing monies, tax collection, service debt collection and administering decedents estates.

The department also offers financial advisory services, and is responsible for the collecting and disbursement of all monies belonging to the County's general fund, and monies held in trust. This pool of funds, which is presently at \$6 billion dollars, is invested in a portfolio of high quality short-term investments. In addition, specific investments are made on behalf of certain pool participants.

Benefits to the participants are many in addition to professional management, safety in size, liquidity and diversification, a higher yield is achieved through large block trading and lower safe-keeping fees.

Investments are also made for the Office of Education, Sanitation Districts, Schools and Special Districts. In 1990 the Pooled Surplus Investment Program yield exceeded the 30 day average of 453 money market mutual funds for the Donoghue Money Market fund by 73 basis points.

There are 19 agencies participating in the pool investment program, which allows a higher rate and allows agencies to invest in fully diversified portfolios. Currently a 7.3% rate of interest is being earned by the Treasury pool and should earn from \$420 to \$430 million dollars in interest in 1990-1991.

All investments are governed by the California government code and comply with department policies and guidelines which are approved by the Board of Supervisors. Safety, legality, liquidity, and yield are watch words for safeguarding funds.

The Treasurer and Tax Collector Department has improved and modernized. Additional policies and procedures have been implemented, such as investment programs, investment data of exchange, county pool investment funds, and a county wide investment consolidation program. The department has been recognized by the National Association of Counties for the Pre-Posting Tax Payment Exceptions Program in 1990. This program streamlined property tax payment processing and strengthened the payment posting process. Previously the processing cost was \$10 dollars, and has now been reduced to \$2 dollars which resulted in annual savings of \$432 thousand dollars.

In cooperation with the District Attorney, the Sheriff, the State Bureau of Narcotics and various city law enforcement agencies, a consolidated bank sweep arrangement was implemented for the county wide multi-jurisdictional deposit of cash seized in narcotics-related cases. This transfer of funds to the County Treasury improved controls and accountability over the funds and expedited filing of District Attorney cases. A county wide cash management program was developed to improve departmental controls against cash handling activity, and expedited the collection and depositing of funds. Mrs. Davis is also an ex-officio and voting member on the Board of Retirement and the Board of Investments that handles the retirement funds of approximately \$9.5 billion dollars, for approximately 109,000 retirement members. This fund is one of the largest in California and the nineteenth largest in the Nation. Monies are invested in any manner that is deemed to be prudent. Investments include real estate, venture capital and fixed income equity.

The T & T C Department also provides staff support to the County's 401(k) and 457 tax deferred savings plans for County employees in investment options and plan contract management.

The County's annual borrowing program averages \$1.1 billion dollars in short term taxable and tax exempt notes, and \$250 million dollars in long term.

The Public Finance Division of the Treasurer and Tax Collector Department developed and implemented the County's first two Community Facilities Districts (CFD), to find alternative means of financing public capital facilities and services in developing areas. CFD's also assist developers in a financial advisory capacity.

Collections are given the highest priority. Approximately 38% of the total budget is geared toward billing and collection. The Collection Division oversees the billing and collection of all debts owed the County. Medical and welfare services, and parking fees are all part of the collection services.

The Secured Property Tax Division handles billing and delinquent property taxes and penalties on all real property within the County of Los Angeles.

Distribution of property tax dollars, in cents, breakdown as \$.08 for special districts, \$.09 for CRA's, \$.19 for Cities, and \$.21 for Schools. Out of each dollar paid, the County receives \$.43 which generates \$1.9 billion in property taxes.

An * followed by highlighted paragraphs indicates revisions to the May 1, 1991 full Commission meeting minutes:

The sources of revenues are 19% in federal assistance, 21% in property taxes, 28% in state assistance and 32% others (parking fees, admission fees, interest and contract city charges).

The department is also a public oriented service that can receive as many as 60,000 calls, and 105,000 taxpayers at cashier windows per year. The Board of Supervisors recognized the need for computerization, and allowed the department \$1.9 million dollars to automate case tracking, and provide a public education system. Services include brochures, speaker bureau, and recorder information. The number of telephone operators was increased which reduced taxpayers waiting time for assistance by 50%.

Foreign language capabilities were instituted so that taxpayers could mail correspondence in their own language and receive replies in that language. Staff are able to interpret 14 languages.

The Public Administrator Operation manages and administers decedents' estates when appointed by the Superior Court. They also provide accounting and property management services for the mentally disabled who are under conservatorship of the Public Guardian.

This Operation installed an automated auction program, resulting in a reduction of man-hours necessary to conduct auctions, thereby reducing cost. These are just some of the roles and operations of the Treasurer & Tax Collector Department. *Mrs. Davis* thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak about her department.

Chairperson Buerk inquired about the taxable borrowing from Japan. The Public Finance Division developed and executed a \$100 million yen loan agreement to finance a portion of the County's unfunded liability in the employee's retirement system. The County is expected to earn an estimated \$1 million dollars per year, over the next 10 years in arbitrage. This loan allowed the department to borrow at a lower rate, and invest at a higher rate.

Commissioner Peever inquired as to the County's tax bond rating and what changes the department foresees in the next five (5) years. The County is rated "A" in short term and "AA" in long term. If there are any changes in rating, hopefully, it will be an upgrade. **Mrs. Davis went on to say that although the State of California is on credit watch, the County is not.*

An * followed by highlighted paragraphs indicates revisions to the May 1, 1991 full Commission meeting minutes:

Commissioner Zimbalist inquired about the delinquency rate for property taxes, and how the County pays it bills. *Mrs. Davis indicated that the average delinquency rate is between 4-5% which is normal for all jurisdictions Statewide.

Commissioner Drown inquired about the income from investments. *Mrs. Davis explained that the County earns somewhere between \$420-\$430 million in interest earnings which are utilized by all participants in the General Fund. Of the General Fund Pool, amounting to an estimated \$6 billion, 43% belongs to the County General Fund. The other 57% belongs to other jurisdictions that participate in the Pool; and they all share in the interest earnings.

Mrs. Davis acknowledged that T & T C does a lot of contracting and identified outside contracts for custodial work performed through the banks, P.A. auctions, tax default property sales, and debt collections where outside collection agencies are used to assist the Department. Mrs. Davis explained that the department consists of represented and non-represented employees, with the significant number of employees represented by Local 660.

Commissioner Thor inquired about the department's relationship with the Assessor Department and the new Assessor. *Mrs. Davis summarized the cooperation of the Register-Recorder, Assessor, Audit-Controller and the Treasurer and Tax Collector Departments. Mrs. Davis said she felt the new Assessor was doing a very good job and explained that he has brought a new positive attitude into his department which will help the T & T C and Auditor-Controller perform more effectively and provide better services for the Board of Supervisors and constituents of Los Angeles County.

John Campbell asked Mrs. Davis to comment on the strategic issues for the Board, and if the Commission could make any contributions to the T & T C Department. Mrs. Davis feels there is a need for more financing and more services due to the population growth, a means to better utilize these services, and manage the internal cash operation. In order to continue to improve in utilizing these resources more new and automated systems are required. *Mrs. Davis indicated that she favors decentralization of the tax collection operation service and would support the relocation of tax collection, debt collection and P.A. Operation in light of the traffic congestion and limited availability of parking around the Civic Center. Mrs. Davis feels the E & E Commission could be helpful in dealing with some of the issues outlined. She also thinks a higher skilled employee, and a smaller operation would be preferable.

An * followed by highlighted paragraphs indicates revisions to the
May 1, 1991 full Commission meeting minutes:

Commissioner Fischbeck inquired if the CFD's bonding goes into administrative cost, what is the percentage, and how many developers have failed. The cost is not based on percentages, but on the actual cost of services rendered. The success rate for developers is very high and they are doing very well. The County does foreclose to retire any debt.

Commissioner Freitag *inquired about the relationship of the P.A. Operation with similar type operations. Mrs. Davis explained that there are several private operations and that their relationship is basically separate and apart from the Public Administrator. The Public Administrator gets cases that no one else wants; cases with no heirs and no substantial value. Mrs. Davis said that the Public Administrator makes every effort to work closely with these private agencies because sometimes the P.A. and the private agencies are dealing with components of the same cases.

Following applause from the Commissioners, Chairperson Buerk thanked Mrs. Davis and Ms. Iwasaki for their excellent presentation, which suggests that the department appears to be functioning well, and that the taxpayers are also well served. The Treasurer & Tax Collector was offered the Commission's assistance in any way needed.

There were no other revisions noted.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Executive Committee Meeting:

The Committee decided to ask the CAO to extend *John Campbell's* contract until the end of September, at which time the *E & E Commission* is due to make its sunset report. It is also important that the Task Force on Sunset also address the staffing issue in its final report, so that it can be dealt with before September 30th.

John Campbell informed the Commissioners that some work is still in progress on the issues of County contracting out. Organization for this task force will be made in the next several weeks.

Meetings with each Supervisor are also in the process of being arranged. Every Commissioner appointed by a Supervisor should attend such a meeting.

VI. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM VISITORS

NONE

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by vote of the Commissioners present.

ATTENDANCE

May 1, 1991

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Alfred Balderrama
Gunther W. Buerk
Ann K. Cooper
Jack Drown
Emma E. Fischbeck
Dr. Alfred Freitag
Chun Y. Lee
Arthur J. Peever
Robert Philibosian
Randolph Stockwell
Wally Thor
Betty Trotter
Robert L. Williams
Efrem Zimbalist III

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED

~~George Bodle~~
~~Joe Crail~~
~~Louise Frankel~~
~~Robert J. Lowe~~
~~Abraham M. Lurie~~
~~Lauro J. Neri~~
~~Daniel M. Shapiro~~

GUEST

Sandra M. Davis, Treasurer & Tax Collector for the County of Los Angeles

VISITORS

None