



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

February 10, 2000

TO: Business Enterprise Committee
FROM: Mayor Bill Bogaard *Bill*
SUBJECT: Review of Commissions

At a special meeting held January 31, 2000, City Council directed the Council committees to review the necessity, mission, parameters and processes of the city's advisory commissions.

The Legislative Policy Committee was directed to review all advisory bodies except those currently reporting through another Council Committee. To reduce the scope of this review, Council members provided information to staff on those commissions that they believe do not warrant review. A summary of Council selections is currently being distributed for review and will be forwarded upon approval. The final list will also include suggestions by Council members to merge or eliminate specific commissions.

The Business Enterprise Committee was specifically charged with reviewing those advisory bodies that currently report through the committee (RBOC, PCAC, PCOC, and CDC) and the commissions and committees associated with the development review process in northwest Pasadena. These include the Fair Oaks and Lincoln Project Area Committees, the Northwest Commission, and the Community Development Committee in relation to the responsibilities of the Business Enterprise Committee and the City Council and/or City Council acting as the Community Development Commission.

In addition, City Council requested that the Mayor forward a list of questions to the Council committees further defining the issues to be addressed. Those issues are listed below:

8/14/2000
ITEM 4 6:00 P.M.

Direction and Results

A review of advisory bodies must begin with the most basic premise of each advisory body – the purpose and functions. Title II of the Pasadena Municipal Code outlines the purpose and functions of each commission. Does the code provide clear and specific direction to each commission and do the staff and commission members understand their charge? Following this, if the staff and commission members are clear on their purpose and functions, are the commissions providing adequate response to this direction? In other words, is the Council finding their analysis and recommendations to be timely and useful in making decisions?

Parameters and Process

Are there too many commissions reviewing similar issues? Although the purpose and functions of each commission may be clear, the parameters may not be defined, resulting in overlapping “jurisdiction” by commissions with a similar charge. Overlap may be the result of multiple commissions focusing on related issues or focus on the same geographical area. In either case, the result is a cumbersome bureaucratic process that slows the business of the city. In these cases, it may be appropriate either to further define the purpose and functions to eliminate overlap or to merge commissions with related purposes.

Commissions with Development Review Authority in Northwest Pasadena

The City is encouraging reinvestment in the northwest portion of Pasadena. However, the process to approve a project with public support is more complex and requires more time than projects elsewhere in the City or within other redevelopment project areas.

The citizen review process for projects located in Northwest Pasadena may involve review by a Project Area Committee, the Northwest Commission, the Community Development Committee, the Business Enterprise Committee and the City Council and/or the City Council acting as the Community Development Commission. These reviews are in addition to any land use/design approval required by the Municipal Code. In addition, the current approach is inconsistent in that there are five project areas in Northwest Pasadena, only two have project area committees.

Appropriateness of Issues

Although a commission may be functioning appropriately, Council may not find their support helpful simply because the issues they review are no longer priority issues of concern or do not require additional analysis. Are the current commissions addressing the most important public policy issues facing the City today? Are there other important policy issues that are not currently being addressed by an advisory commission? If yes, could these issues logically be addressed by an existing commission or would they require a new commission? Before creating new advisory bodies, Council may want to consider if any existing commissions could be restructured, combined, or sunset in favor of addressing more current issues.

Membership, Attendance, and Quorums

Community participation, or lack of participation, may be a good indicator of the relevancy of a commission. If willing participants cannot be located within the community or if commissions are frequently unable to meet quorum requirements because of low attendance, Council may want to examine the role of the commission to determine why there is no interest. It may be that the purpose and functions of the commission are not clear, leaving commission members with few assignments, or that the issues are no longer relevant and do not generate interest within the community. Why do some commissions consistently lack full membership or have poor attendance?

Operating Companies

Many of the issues outlined above also apply to operating companies. However, the fundamental question for operating companies is whether or not they should continue to operate independently from the city or become a city department. To this end, Council members may want to review how the community benefits from independent operations and if the operating company is achieving success along these lines. In addition, Council may want to question the make-up of the operating company board and how appointments from agencies outside the city further the goals of the organization.

This review is a significant undertaking, both as to the work required and its importance. There is obvious interest on the part of the public and opportunity for public comment will be an important part of the process. This memo is intended to provide a framework of issues; suggestions from the members of the Committee as to how to proceed are welcome.

***Summary is based on 6 out of 10 members submitting questionnaires**

**Review of City Council Advisory Bodies
BUSINESS ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE**

**SUMMARY
ROSE BOWL OPERATING COMPANY**

Are the purpose, parameters and goals of this operating company clear? Yes No
If no, please describe the areas needing definition or clarification: 6 0

- The operating agreement between the city and the RBOC generally describes the purpose, parameters and goals of the RBOC. The one piece that has been unclear is the City Council's view of just how much the RBOC should be contributing dollar-wise to the city.
- By-laws and the recent city council on the FY 2000/2001 budget make this clear.

Are the staff and board members clear on their role within the city? Yes No
If no, please describe the inconsistencies you perceive between the intended role of the board and staff and their actions: 6 0

- The one area that has not been clear is the city's expectation about how much the RBOC should be contributing primarily to the city.

Is this operating company performing adequately and providing the intended benefits of an operating company? Yes No
If no, please describe the inadequacies you perceive: 6 0

- Turning the financial accounting over to the RBOC in-house has helped a great deal.
- Up until the last year, we did not have a solid grip on the financial side. That has improved very significantly and continues to improve. The reason for that situation is very complex.

Are there other commissions or advisory bodies reviewing similar issues resulting in overlapping "jurisdictions" with this commission? Yes No
2 3

- Parks and Recreation.
- Arroyo Seco Planning Committee.

Is the operating company addressing all of the important issues related to their charge? Yes No
If no, what other related issues need to be addressed? 6 0

Could these new issues logically be addressed by this board? Yes No
If no, how could they best be addressed? 0 0

Is the membership of the operating company appropriate with respect to outside agencies? Yes No
If no, please describe our perceptions as to why this is a problem: 5 1

- Though UCLA and Tournament representatives have been committed and valuable members, it is not appropriate to have tenants as members.
- UCLA and T of R should at least have ex-officio representation.

Does this board consistently have good attendance? Yes No
If no, please describe your perceptions as to why this is a problem. 6 0

Should the RBOC remain as an independent operating company? Yes No
If no, please describe your perceptions as to why: 6 0

- The RBOC provides a valuable service to the city and the community by providing a forum that specifically focuses on a key asset/responsibility, financial and otherwise of the city.

In summary, what actions should be taken to improve the effectiveness of this operating Company in providing the intended benefits to the city?

- Clarify that the Rose Bowl foundation should be of, by, and for residents of the city.
- More clarity with respect to city's need for cash and city's need to accommodate neighbors who wish to cap events. Which is more important?
- Keep up the progress toward improving the financial accounting/reporting for RBOC.
- Continue to be actively involved in Arroyo Planning and neighborhood issues.
- Further clarification of the city's long-term expectation of the level of financial contribution from the RBOC to the city would be very helpful in long-range planning by the RBOC.