

SUMMARY REPORT ON THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CITIZENS
ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMITTEE

February 3, 1971

The Los Angeles County Citizens Economy and Efficiency Committee was created by resolution of the Board of Supervisors in June 1964. The committee is composed of twenty-one members, who serve without compensation of any kind. Chairman of the committee is Mr. Robert Mitchell, retired Chairman of the Board, Consolidated Rock Products Company.

Committee Operation

The committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Board of Supervisors. It is charged with the responsibility to undertake studies of Los Angeles County government and to make recommendations directed towards cutting costs and increasing efficiency. It is also from time to time asked to make recommendations on matters referred to it by the Board.

The County furnishes an office and the services of a full-time executive secretary and a secretary. To assist it in its studies, the committee has called on experts in the industrial, professional and consulting fields who have been loaned by their respective companies without cost to the County. On occasion, at the committee's request, the County has assigned a staff analyst to assist the committee on a particular project. The committee has also had invaluable assistance from many other County officials both in the conduct of its studies and in the preparation of its reports.' The committee budget has averaged \$38,000 to \$40,000 annually.

Committee Recommendations

During its tenure the committee has submitted 16 reports and 20 letters to the Board of Supervisors. The letters covered the committee's comments on various policy items and other County matters. Of the reports, four were minor progress reports to the Board. The other twelve contained 72 separate recommendations proposing major changes in the County's method of operation.

County Action on Committee Recommendations

The Board approved 68 of these recommendations, generally after conducting a public hearing. Of the 68 recommendations approved, 35 have been fully implemented, 6 partially implemented, and 2 are in process.

Twenty-nine recommendations for various reasons have not been implemented. In some instances, the County has taken no action. In one case, the authorization to act has been blocked in the State Legislature. Finally, as with the recommendations in County Proposition B in the last general election, the voters defeated the committee's proposals for change.

The following table lists the 12 reports, the recommendations contained in each, and the action taken on each recommendation.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS,
COUNTY ACTION, AND CURRENT STATUS

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
<p><u>PRODUCTIVITY IN COUNTY DEPARTMENTS - Oct. 19, 1965</u></p> <p>1. The results of the work measurement study in the County Recorder's Department and the Department of Weights and Measures be put into effect.</p> <p>2. The Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Administrative Officer to establish a formal work measurement program to be extended to all appropriate functions in the County.</p> <p>3. The Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to hire two or more specialists to form the nucleus of the work measurement effort.</p> <p>4. A management audit function be established in the Chief Administrative Office, the function to be initiated with existing personnel.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>The Committee's report was based on a joint study by the Chief Administrative Office and the committee. To date the program has eliminated 1,028 positions resulting in annual savings of \$7.8 million.</p>
<p><u>CIVIL SERVICE OPERATIONS - Nov. 16, 1965</u></p> <p>1. The Board of Supervisors approve the proposal of our committee to obtain the services immediately of two personnel specialists from industry to assist it in formulating recommendations directed towards streamlining Civil Service Procedures.</p> <p>2. The Board recommend to the Civil Service Commission that it hold an interdepartmental examination to fill the position of Secretary and assist Chief Examiner to the Commission under the specification outlined in this report.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Two personnel specialists from the Pacific Telephone Company and from the Southern California Edison Company were loaned to the committee for two months.</p> <p>The Civil Service Commission asked to defer the appointment of Secretary and Chief Examiner until completion of the committee's study.</p>
<p><u>REPORT ON CIVIL SERVICE OPERATIONS</u></p> <p>The committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors request the Civil Service Commission to take the following actions.</p> <p>1. Appoint as a first step an interim Secretary and Chief Examiner to implement the committee's recommendations. At the same time, establish an advisory committee to assist the interim Secretary in accomplishing the recommended reforms. When major reforms are accomplished or being implemented, conduct and interdepartmental promotional examination for Secretary and Chief Examiner open to all qualified managers in the County. Write the requirements to emphasize broad administrative ability rather than technical personnel experience.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Civil Service Commission did not act on these recommendations until agreement was reached with the E&E Committee on a proposed amendment to the County Charter covering a complete reorganization of County Charter personnel functions. See <u>Charter Amendment on Personnel Functions, August 23, 1966.</u></p>

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
2. Delegate to the Secretary and Chief Examiner clear and complete responsibility for daily administration of the Civil Service Department. Reserve to the Commission the formulation of top level policy and primary responsibility for final decisions regarding all appropriate employee appeals.	Yes	Yes	The Secretary and Chief Examiner was replaced by a Director of Personnel after the voters approved the Charter Amendment in the 1966 general election.
3. Delegate more responsibility for recruitment, selection, and classification to the larger departments of the County.	Yes	Partial	Officials in other County department report a major improvement in the operation of their Personnel function in almost all areas since the Charter Amendment. They report excellent cooperation in recruitment, setting up examinations, administering eligibility lists and conducting classifications studies. They report that the time required to establish eligibility lists on standard examinations has been reduced from 3-4 months to 6-8 weeks. The use of the eligible register system (continuous daily examinations system) has doubled.
4. Streamline the standard examination system to reduce the time required to establish eligibility lists. Extend the eligible register system wherever practical in the selection process.	Yes	Yes	
5. Permit more flexibility in the determination of time length for eligibility lists, with a general objective of shortening the effective period of the lists.	Yes	Yes	
6. Transfer more responsibility for promotional evaluation to departmental management, especially in departmental examinations. Develop a procedure to standardize promotional evaluations for interdepartmental examinations.	Yes	Partial	
7. Revise classification procedures to reduce the time between request for classification and inclusion of the change in the Salary Ordinance.	Yes	Yes	
8. Establish standard procedure for investigating the education, work experience, and police records of prospective employees.	Yes	No	The Personnel department checks police records. Further investigation is left to the departments. It is a question whether more thorough check would justify the cost.
<u>ORGANIZATION PLANNING IN COUNTY GOVERNMENT, May 24, 1966</u>			
1. An Organization Planning function be established in the Chief Administrative Office.	Yes	No	An organization specialist from North American Aviation, Inc. assisted the committee in this study. No action was taken on these three recommendations. The County still lacks an effective organization planning program.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to employ an experienced organization specialist to direct and form the nucleus of the Organization Planning Function.	Yes	No	
3. The Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Administrative Officer, in conjunction with the director of Organization Planning to be employed, to formulate and publish to all accountable members of management the basic principles of organization to be followed throughout County government and the procedures for review and approval of proposed organizational changes to be adhered to prior to any implementation	Yes	No	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
<p>4. The present efforts underway in the consolidation of certain smaller Country offices into larger groupings, the centralization of basic services common to all Country offices and departments, and the study and analysis of organizational problems previously brought to the attention of your Board continue uninterrupted until such time as the proper transfer of responsibility can be made to the newly established Organization Planning function.</p>	Yes	Partial	Two Charter Amendments sponsored by the Committee one dividing the huge Charities department into the departments of Hospitals, Adoptions, and Public Social Services, the other giving the Board greater authority to consolidate or separate departments were approved by the voters in the 1966 general election. Since then the Registrar and Recorder have been merged and the Board has approved consolidation of the Hospitals, Health, and Mental Health departments.
<p><u>COUNTY PERSONNEL ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION--July 26, 1966</u></p>			
<p>1. The Board of Supervisors instruct the County Counsel to prepare a charter amendment permitting the consolidation of all personnel activities into a single department under the administration of a Personnel Director appointed by and reporting directly to the Board. The Civil Service Commission should retain its appellate authority for hearing and making final decisions regarding all appropriate employee appeals, should continue to prescribe Civil Service rules involving the appeal rights of employees, and should act in an advisory capacity to our Board for formulation of time level Civil Service Policy. The amendment should also insure that the present merit system principles are maintained in the administration of the County's personnel operation.</p>	Defer	Partial	The Civil Service Commission did not act on these recommendations until agreement was reached with the E&E Committee on a proposed amendment to the County Charter covering a complete reorganization of County Charter personnel functions. See <u>Charter Amendment on Personnel Functions, August 23, 1966.</u>
<p>2. In the interim, until the voters approve a charter amendment, the Board reaffirms its request to the Civil Service Commission to implement the recommendations in the Economy and Efficiency Committee's previous report on Civil Service Operations.</p>	Yes	Yes	The County unquestionably is far ahead of most government agencies in developing standard bargaining procedures and a professional employee relations program.
<p>3. The Board authorize establishment of an employee relations function with responsibility for management-employee relations, including negotiations with employees to develop joint recommendations on salary rates and working conditions for final decision by the Board.</p>	Yes	Yes	This responsibility is shared with the Employee Relations Commission which was established to administer the new Employee Relations Ordinance.
<p>4. The Board assign to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility for hearing any appeal by an employee who claims violation of any Board motion or ordinance relating to salary rates and working conditions.</p>	Yes	Yes	The Civil Service Commission and the Committee reached agreement on the Charter Amendment. The Commission agreed to appoint an interim Secretary and Chief Examiner and delegate to him full responsibility for administering the department and
<p><u>CHARTER AMENDMENT ON PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS--Aug. 23, 1966</u></p>			
<p>1. The Board of Supervisors approve the proposed draft of the charter amendment covering the reorganization of County personnel functions.</p>	Yes	Yes	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
<p>2. To the extent possible under the present Charter, the responsible County officers should begin immediately to lay the groundwork for consolidation of the County's personnel functions.</p>	Yes	Yes	implementing the Committee's Civil Service recommendations. The committee agreed that the Commission should remain as department head with the authority to appoint the Director of Personnel.
<p><u>COUNTY COMPENSATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES, August 3, 1966</u></p>			
<p>1. The Board of Supervisors employ an outside management consulting firm to - develop and recommend more effective procedures for determination of pay scales for jobs existing primarily in government.</p>	Yes	In process	
<p>2. The Board set compensation for all craft jobs on the basis of a survey covering comparable jobs with similar working conditions.</p>	No	No	
<p>3. The Board authorize a study by a management consulting firm of County executive compensation to be completed by April 1, 1967, the study to be conducted under the supervision of the Economy and Efficiency Committee.</p>	Yes	Yes	The committee's report was based on a study conducted by a special Industry Committee organized by the E&E Committee. The Special Industry Committee was composed of the vice presidents and directors of personnel and their wage and salary managers from eleven major companies in the area. The special committee devoted four months to the study.
<p>4. The County conduct separate surveys of employee benefit programs in the community. In making adjustments to the County's benefit program, consider the entire package of benefits in comparison to area practice.</p>	Yes	Yes	
<p>5. The Board instruct the County representatives on the Joint Salary Survey to propose to the other agencies seven changes in survey procedure.</p>			
<p>(1) Classify employers participating in the Joint Salary Survey by a more detailed breakdown than the four major types now listed.</p>	Yes	Yes	On the first recommendation the Board authorized the Personnel department to conduct the study rather than use an outside consultant and authorized four additional positions. The study was initiated in September, 1970, and will cover all classifications in the County except the top executive levels. The department now has seven to eight people assigned to the project. It is scheduled for completion in 2½ years.
<p>(2) Publish this more detailed breakdown for each job surveyed.</p>	Yes	Yes	
<p>(3) Identify the jobs which are considered comparable to those in County service.</p>	Yes	No	The other three agencies who participated in the joint salary study rejected most of the recommendations on survey procedures.
<p>(4) Show actual rates and scheduled hours per week in the published salary data in addition to converting such rates to a 40-hour week.</p>	Yes	No	
<p>(5) Collect information on changes in salaries during the past year as well as the distribution of current salaries</p>	Yes	Partial	
<p>(6) Include, wherever possible, data for more than one level of job in each occupational group studied.</p>	Yes	No	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
(7) Secure data for the Joint Salary Survey through joint activity with the U S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the California State	Yes	No	
6. The Board instruct the County personnel staff to compute and compare community and County averages in order to limit payment of more than the average rate in the community only to those jobs where circumstances	Yes	Yes	This review will have more value if it is postponed for one or two years. At that time, the review committee will be able to evaluate the progress of the Countywide classification study now in progress.
7. The Board appoint a special committee of qualified individuals at least every five years to make an overall appraisal and audit of County compensation polices and practices.	Yes	No	
<u>EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION--April 5, 1967</u>			
1. The Board of Supervisors authorize a contract with the management consulting firm of our selection to develop a systematic compensation plan for a fee not to exceed \$34,600.	Yes	No	The consultant was hired and conducted the study. The Board rejected the consultant recommendation's and referred the report to the committee for further study. See <u>Executive Compensation in L.A. County Government, May 1968</u>
2. The Board give this recommendation its unanimous support.			
<u>CONSOLIDATION OF SHERIFF-MARSHAL FUNCTIONS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY - Sept. 1967</u>			
The Board take all necessary action to secure State legislation that will enable the County to consolidate the bailiff and civil process function under the Sheriff.	No	No	Two systems specialists from TRW Systems and one analyst from the CAO assisted the committee in this study. Estimated savings were \$1.5 million annually. A Bill authorizing the consolidation has been blocked in the State Legislature for the past 3 years.
<u>EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION IN LOS ANGLS COUNTY GOVERNMENT - May, 1968</u>			
1. The Board of Supervisors adopt the salary schedules recommended in Tables I and II for the fiscal year 1968-69, finding that they satisfy the prevailing wage requirement in Section 47 of the County Charter.	Yes	No	The committee appointed a subcommittee of four months reviewing the consultant's recommendations and much additional data. The committee report, based upon the subcommittee's finding generally recommended lower rates than the consultant had recommended
2. The Board annul any policy which prescribes parity between selected departments in the County and their counterparts in another single government agency, such as the City of Los Angeles.	Yes	Yes	
3. The Board place executives now on flat rates at the top of the recommended schedule to provide equal treatment with executives currently on salary schedules.	Yes	Yes	The Board had returned to a policy of parity with L.A. City for police and fire positions. The County has since been engaged in a round robin contest with the City in which each agency takes its turn raising salaries on a per with or above the other.
4. The Board adopt the standard step progression system for new department heads.	Yes	No	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
<p>5. The Board appoint an Executive Salary Review Committee to assist the Director of Personnel in maintaining the executive salary system and to review changes in department head and chief deputy salary schedules each year. The Committee should consist of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Director of Personnel, the President of the Management Council and two salary administration specialists selected from outside the County.</p> <p>6. The Board approve in principle the executive salary program and procedures presented in this report</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Partial</p>	<p>The relative ranking of executives--except for sheriff and fire officials still follows the pattern recommended by the committee</p>
<p><u>LOS ANGELES COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES - March, 1969</u></p>			
<p>1. The Board of Supervisors establish an Architectural Evaluation Board consisting of five members serving for two-year, overlapping terms</p> <p>The Architectural Evaluation Board will have two principal functions (I) It will prepare and maintain a file on architects who have requested consideration for County work; (2) It will submit a recommended list architects to the Board of Supervisors for each capital project which the County has determined will be contracted to an outside architect. The supervisors will make their final selection from this list.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The selection system appears to be working well. With the help of County personnel, the Architectural Evaluation Board has developed a consistent, systematic grading system for evaluating architects to determine which are most qualified for a given project.</p>
<p>2. The Board of Supervisors establish the following policies and procedures for the operation of the Architectural Evaluation Board</p> <p>(1) Architect Files - Architects will indicate their interest in performing County work by sending in a brochure and by filling out a questionnaire giving detailed information on the firm's capabilities and experience.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>(2) Capability Categories - The file on architects should be broken down as the Architectural Evaluation Board determines, into appropriate categories.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>(3) County Staff Assistance - The work of the Architectural Evaluation Board should be closely supported by clerical, technical and advisory assistance from the County staff in the Capital Projects Division of the Chief Administrative Office and the Architectural and Construction Divisions of the County Engineer.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
(4) Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors - In submitting its list of recommended architects to the Board of Supervisors for a particular project, the Architectural Evaluation Board may adopt several approaches depending upon the project. On large, complex projects, for example, the submitted list may include only a few firms. On smaller projects, particularly those which require specialized experience, the list might include a much larger number of firms	Yes	Yes	
(5) Joint Venture Arrangements - The County discontinue the practice of appointing "multiple architects" on large projects."	Yes	Yes	
(6) Design Competitions - Use of design competitions is not an effective method for selecting architects to perform work for the County.	Yes	Yes	
(7) Rotating Appointments - The County make a special effort to spread, awards among qualified architects by restricting architects to one County project at a time. The Architectural Evaluation Board, however, should be free to recommend an exception to this policy if it concludes that the firm most qualified for a given project would be disqualified.	Yes	Yes	Beginning in April, 1970, the Board has made 28 appointments using the new selection system. Nineteen appointments have been to architects without previous experience with the County. The other nine have been made to architects who have completed their contract or for modifications or additions to work already performed.
(8) Performance Reports - Once a project is completed, the Chief Administrative Officer and the County Engineer should jointly prepare a report evaluating the architect's performance. This report should be made a permanent part of the architect's file and should be used by the Architectural Evaluation Board to evaluate his qualifications.	Yes	Yes	
3. The Management Audit section in the Chief Administrative Office conduct a study in conjunction with the Capital Projects Division and the Engineer to develop a clear delineation of responsibility and control procedures for the administration of construction projects.	Yes	In Process	The previous CAO and the County Engineer made some changes to strengthen administrative control on construction projects. The new CAO has given the study top priority. He has assigned two analysis as the nucleus of a task force to conduct the study.
4. The Board of Supervisors continue the present policy of assigning large construction projects to contract architects and small or maintenance projects to the County Engineer.	Yes	Yes	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
5. The Board assign master planning projects to the County Engineer unless the project requires talents of a specialized nature not ordinarily available on the County staff.	Yes	Yes	
6. The Board direct the County Engineer to expand the program for the proportion and adaptation of standard plans for receptive projects.	Yes	No	The facilities for which the County has let design contracts since the committee's report have been too dissimilar to allow application of a standard plan.
7. The Board directs the County Engineer to reestablish and expand the program of written standards covering materials and equipment to be used for county facilities.	Yes	Yes	
<u>LOS ANGELES COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES - March, 1969</u>			
1. The Board of Supervisors place an amendment to the County Charter on the ballot in November, 1970, general election, the amendment to include the following provisions.			The Charter Amendment (County Proposition B) was approved by Supervisors Debs, Bonelli, Chace and Dorn. It was endorsed by the Greater Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, The California Tax Payers Association of California, The 1970 Grand Jury, The Grand Jurors Association, and most of the newspapers, radio stations and televisions in the County.
(1) A position with the title "County Chief Executive" shall be established by charter provision. The County Chief Executive shall act as executive head of the County with broad appointment and dismissal authority.	Yes	No	
(2) The Chief Executive shall be appointed by a majority vote of the Board of Supervisors following an open competitive examination process based upon merit.	Yes	No	It was signed by Supervisor Hahn and the County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO.
(3) The Chief Executive shall serve at the pleasure of the Board without civil service or contract tenure.	Yes	No	The L.A. County Employees Association remained neutral.
(4) The County charter shall outline in general terms the responsibilities of the Chief Executive for the organization, planning, direction and control of county operations.	Yes	No	
(5) The charter shall include a provision which gives the Chief Executive authority, subject to approval of the Board, to reorganize County departments reporting to him into agencies, each agency to consist of departments performing related functions. It shall also include a provision which gives the Chief Executive authority, subject to approval of the Board, to establish an incentive pay plan for County executives.	Yes	No	The voters defeated the amendment by a vote of 1,040,391 (56.43%) NO to 803,168 (43.56%) YES.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	BOARD APPROVAL	IMPLEMENTED	COMMENTS
(6) The authority to appoint or dismiss the Director of Personnel, now delegated by the County Charter to the Civil Service Commission, shall be transferred to the Chief Executive.	Yes	No	
(7) Subject to majority approval of the Board of Supervisors, the Chief Executive shall appoint or dismiss all agency heads and department heads except the three elected officials and certain designated	Yes	No	
(8) Agency heads and department heads shall be exempt from the classified service. The Chief Executive shall have the authority, subject to approval of the Board, to exempt other executives who hold upper level positions in a department, such as chief deputy.	Yes	No	
(9) Executives in the unclassified service shall be appointed through a competitive selection process based on merit.	Yes	No	
(10) If an executive in the unclassified service is replaced, he shall have the right to return to civil service tenure on an appropriate organizational level as determined by the Chief Executive.	Yes	No	
(11) Present County officials in positions which have been assigned to the unclassified service shall retain their civil service status for a period of five years. At the end of five years, or if they retire before five years, their positions shall be made exempt.	Yes	No	
2. The Board of Supervisors place the question of increasing the Board to seven members on the ballot in the November, 1970, general election as an amendment to the County Charter	No	No	A majority of the committee opposed an increase in the Board. A minority supported an increase. The committee unanimously recommended, however, The Board voted 3 - 2 against the recommendation.