

**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, December 10, 1969
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: Hall of Administration, Room 739

Robert Mitchell,
Chairman

Raymond Arbuthnot
Dr. John C. Bollens
Davis Brabant
John D. Byork
Maurice Rene Chez
Roc Cutri
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
Ray Arbuthnot
Dr. John Bollens
Davis Brabant
John Byork
Maurice Chez
Roc Cutri
Dr. Warren Jones
Mrs. Ray Kidd
Harlan Loud
P. S. Magruder
Kiyoshi Maruyama
Irvin Mazzei
L. E. McKee
Louis Rogers
George Shellenberger
Mrs. Benjamin Erick Smith
William Torrence

Members Absent:

Ferdinand Mendenhall
Gus Walker

GUEST SPEAKER

Mr. M. D. Tarshes, County Manager
San Mateo County

Mr. Mitchell called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. He introduced the committee members to Mr. Tarshes and then asked Dr. Bollens, Chairman of the Task Force, to introduce Mr. Tarshes.

Dr. Bollens said that Mr. Tarshes had served on the staff of the chief administrative office in San Diego County for eight years. He then went to Sacramento County as County Executive where he served for thirteen years. About a year ago, on his own volition, he left Sacramento County to assume the position of County Manager of San Mateo County.

Mr. Tarshes said he would first discuss the manner of selection and the authority and responsibility of the chief executive. He said that among the options available the preferable one is an appointed chief executive. He should serve at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors with no term of appointment and no tenure, civil service or contract. The charter should specify the qualifications of the position in general terms. Selection should be by an open competitive, merit system process. The chief executive should be subject to dismissal by the board with the possible limitation that such action would require a four-fifths vote.

The authority and responsibility of the chief executive should be stated in general terms in the charter. He should appoint all department heads except

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 10, 1970

Page 2

those who are elected and the county counsel. The county executive should have four principal responsibilities: (1) the general administration and coordination of all county activities; (2) intergovernmental and community relationships at the staff level - as distinguished from the political level; (3) recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on almost all policy matters affecting both the internal operation of county government and the external relationships with the community; and (4) budget review and recommendations.

Next Mr. Tarshes discussed the authority and status of department heads. He said department heads should be given the widest possible latitude in administering the departments including making all appointments within the department. The appointment and dismissal of department heads by the county executive should be subject to a confirmation by a majority of the Board of Supervisors.

On the question of departmental structure, Mr. Tarshes recommended that departments performing related functions be grouped together in five or six major agencies. The agencies would be directed by agency chiefs appointed by the chief executive subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors. The agency chiefs in turn would appoint the department heads in their agencies subject to confirmation by the chief executive.

Mr. Tarshes said he thought all commissions and committees should be limited to advisory and appellate functions. They should never be involved in direct administration.

Mr. Tarshes then discussed the size of the Board of Supervisors. His view, he said, is that there is no magic in any size. There is no automatic virtue in having more than five members. The key test is not the number of board members but the awareness of and the responsiveness to the real needs of the community. The potential complications, the potential for wheel spinning, grows geometrically, he said, as the board members are increased arithmetically. Moreover, as the board is increased, the authority of each board member is diluted. This results in a decreased ability to be responsive to the electorate.

Mr. Tarshes concluded with a description of the East Palo Alto Municipal Advisory Council. He said that perhaps such an elected advisory council for a designated unincorporated area provides more effective representation than does an increase in the size of the Board of Supervisors. He said that in San Mateo County an elected advisory council of five members had been established for East Palo Alto two years ago. Although this advisory council has not been free of problems, it has worked very effectively in providing communication between the East Palo Alto community and the San Mateo Board of Supervisors.

Dr. Bollens opened the question period by asking whether the people in a given area should have the right to initiate the formation of a municipal advisory council. Mr. Tarshes said that he would not foreclose the right to initiate but the board should have the final authority to approve or deny the petition.

E & E COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 10, 1970

Page 3

Dr. Bollens asked Mr. Tarshes if he agreed that there should be limited naming of specific departments and agencies in the charter. Mr. Tarshes said that the charter should allow as much flexibility as possible on organizational structure so that the county executive and the board of supervisors can change this structure in line with future needs.

Mr. Chez asked if an advisory council provides a better means of communication in the community than individual deputies or administrative assistants on each supervisor's staff. Mr. Tarshes said that even with an advisory council, the board members would still need their staff deputies and assistants. He said that the advisory council in some ways provided a better representation of the community views since an advisory council is elected by the people of the community.

Mr. Rogers asked how much the county executive should be paid since he would be given so much additional responsibility. Mr. Tarshes replied that the additional responsibilities assigned to the county executive and to department heads should be given recognition in the salary system. He said, however, he could not propose specific rates for Los Angeles County.

Dr. Bollens asked that in Mr. Tarshes experience with charter reform he could cite any lessons which would be useful to the committee. Mr. Tarshes said that in San Mateo County in 1960, after a study, thirteen different charter amendments, all of them very complicated, were put on the ballot. All failed except one, and that one was a very innocuous amendment. He said, therefore, that although many changes might be proposed, the committee should be practical in evaluating how much ought to be proposed in one package.

Mr. Roche asked Mr. Tarshes to comment on the advantages and disadvantages of the appointed county manager and the elected chief executive. Mr. Tarshes said that the elected executive provided political identification, and that this was important. However, this advantage, he felt, was overridden by certain disadvantages. The elected executive could become a political funnel, and this funnel could become a bottleneck. Inaction can result because too much is pouring through it. There is also a great potential for wheel spinning because of conflicts between the elected chief executive and the board of supervisors.

Dr. Bollens thanked Mr. Tarshes for his assistance to the committee and turned the meeting back to Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell also thanked Mr. Tarshes and adjourned the meeting at 3:32 p.m.