Participation Study Group

June 25, 1997

Meeting Packet
Table of Contents

AGENDA

CHARTER REFORM COMMISSION
STUDY GROUP ON PARTICIPATION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1997
5:30 p.m.

Water and Power Building, Room 1559
111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Contact - Raphael Sonenshein, Study Group Staff - (213) 367-5234

---

1. **Roll call**
2. **Approval of minutes**
3. **Staff report and discussion of participation issues in the Charter**
4. **Guest speaker (to be announced)**
5. **Comments by Commissioners on subject matters within the Study Group's jurisdiction**
6. **Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Study Group's jurisdiction**

MINUTES

CHARTER REFORM COMMISSION
STUDY GROUP ON PARTICIPATION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1997

6:30 p.m. or at the conclusion of the Commission meeting
Water and Power Building, Room 1559
111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Doris Isolini Nelson - Study Group Leader
Contact - Raphael Sonenshein, Study Group Staff - 213/367-5234
Jason Parry, Study Group Staff - 213/367-5161

---

1. Roll call

   Members Present: Marguerite Archie-Hudson, Jose De Sosa, George David Kieffer (*ex officio*), Stewart Kwoh, Doris Nelson, Sharon Schuster, and staff -- Raphael Sonenshein and Jason Parry

   Members Absent: Andrew Friedman

2. Discussion of organizational matters for study group and possible criteria for analyzing policy options.
   - Doris Isolini Nelson suggested objectives for the study group
   - Raphael Sonenshein recommended role of staff and reviewed meeting materials
   - The group discussed various criteria and definitions relating to participation
   - The group established that three commissioners comprise a quorum
   - Sharon Schuster was elected Study Group Vice-Leader by voice vote
   - Raphael Sonenshein reviewed assignments for next meeting

3. Comments by Commissioners on subject matters within the Commission's jurisdiction

   None

4. Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Commission's jurisdiction

   - Ron Ingram expressed dissatisfaction with a lack of coordination between appointed commission and elected commission

MINUTES

CHARTER REFORM COMMISSION
STUDY GROUP ON PARTICIPATION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1997
6:30 p.m.

Water and Power Building, Room 1559
111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Doris Isolini Nelson - Study Group Leader
Contact - Raphael Sonenshein, Study Group Staff - (213) 367-5234
Jason Parry, Study Group Staff - (213) 367-5161

---

1. Roll call

   Members Present: Marguerite Archie-Hudson, Jose De Sosa, Andrew Friedman, George David Kieffer (*ex officio*), Stewart Kwoh, Sharon Schuster, and staff -- Raphael Sonenshein and Jason Parry

   Members Absent: Doris Isolini Nelson

2. Minutes of June 11, 1997 approved, as amended

3. Discussion of assignments and discussion of criteria for evaluating participation proposals and problem definition in the area of participation

   Staff report on forms of American democracy
   Study Group discussed the purpose of city government
   Study Group discussed readings from The Rebirth of Urban Democracy
   Study Group discussed civic culture in the City of Los Angeles

4. Comments by Commissioners on subject matters within the Study Group's jurisdiction

   None

5. Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Study Group's jurisdiction

   None

Participation Criteria

Participation criteria noted in 6/11 Study Group Meeting

Individual empowerment
Access to government
High neighborhood participation
Real responsibility and decision-making power
Higher voting rates
Making government matter
Clarity of representation
Immigrant involvement
Diversity
Local autonomy
Community interaction
Government responsiveness
Efficiency
Accountability

Forms of Democracy: A Review

Representative Democracy: A system that depends on the election of people entrusted to make decisions in government, but ultimately accountable to voters. Built into the founding of the American system of government. Low "participation costs." Durable, stable, widespread.

Direct Democracy: A system first implemented by Progressive reformers, between the 1890's and the 1930's in order to resolve the power of special interests to subvert representative democracy. Also relied on electoral mechanisms, but allowed the voters to use the ballot to directly intervene in the government. Medium "participation costs." More common in the western states, where Progressive movement was strongest.

Participatory Democracy: Outgrowth of social ferment of the 1950's and 1960's. Treats participation itself as a value, and is suspicious of large electoral mechanisms. Emphasizes face-to-face decision-making, drawing on the "town meeting" model of a smaller-scale democracy. Widely discussed in the 1970's, but only a bit of research available on it today. High "participation costs." No particular regional pattern.

The Prospects for Participatory Democracy: A Brief Analysis

Prepared for the City of Los Angeles
Charter Reform Commission
Participation Study Group

by Raphael Sonenshein

June 25, 1997

A close reading of The Rebirth of Urban Democracy offers some interesting and important lessons in our work on participatory democracy. The analysis of participatory mechanisms in five very different cities indicates that there are some valuable contributions made by this form of democracy that might be applicable to our work. At the same time, the authors caution against undue expectations of what neighborhood democracy can accomplish.

The five cities (St. Paul, Birmingham, Portland, San Antonio, and Dayton) could not be more different from each other in ethnic composition, socioeconomic status, and geographic location. Unlike the movement for "direct democracy" that was far more common west of Mississippi River, the experiment with participatory democracy follows no such geographical pattern. They have in common the fact that in each city, a public policy decision was made and implemented to conduct a citywide program of neighborhood participation. In addition, these citywide programs were relatively successful.

(The actual structures used by the five cities are summarized on pages 12-14 of

the book, and are included at the end of this report.)

Last week, we discussed the first evidence that the authors presented on the effect of these participatory programs. The first evidence, that participatory democracy did not lead to a broad increase in participation (such as voting), seemed disappointing. But in the chapters to follow, the authors set forth a set of positive outcomes that provide greater hope for such programs.

In chapter six, the authors show that neighborhood groups did not succeed in placing items on the public agenda. The agenda continued to be set by elected officials and other leaders. But in chapter 6, the authors show that even though neighborhood groups did not set the agenda of policy debate, they had a considerable impact on the outcomes of policy once the debate was underway. While business interests generally succeeded in getting their interests on the public agenda, they were not notably successful in winning battles when they faced neighborhood organizations.

The authors point out that business almost always won "big ticket" development controversies, such as the building of a sports stadium. The authors point out that the fear that neighborhood power would block citywide developments was not borne out in these five cities. But on developments that only affected a particular neighborhood, business was far less successful in getting its way. In fact, policy responsiveness to neighborhoods was greatest in those cities where structured representation systems were the strongest.

In the five cities, neighborhood groups became central actors in development decisions that affected neighborhoods. In fact, the rules of the game were changed by the recognition of city leaders and business leaders that they had to deal with the

neighborhoods; such a working relationship became a part of doing business in the city.

In Chapter 7, the authors assessed how the public and government officials saw the neighborhood associations. They found that the public in each city had great confidence in the neighborhood associations, and that city hall leaders also had a high regard for them. They concluded that "the neighborhood-based participation systems in the five core cities of our study fulfill a model of democracy substantially different from the representative democracy that exists in most American cities." (189) In other words, neighborhood groups had more credibility and popularity than the official branches of government.

In Chapters 8, 9, and 10, the authors take on some of the beliefs about neighborhood democracy: that it promotes conflict, alienation, delay, intolerance, and other sins. Their surveys of citizens in the five cities found just the opposite: residents felt that neighborhood democracy reduced conflict and gave them a sense of efficacy. Delay was seen as a positive outcome if it prevented an unwanted development in a neighborhood. And intolerance did not seem to result.

In sum, the authors conclude that neighborhood democracy works, that it leads to a higher sense of empowerment, that it can have an effect on public policy, and that it can increase the credibility of the public policy process. But they also introduce some cautions that are echoed in other literature, and that ought to concern us in our deliberations in Los Angeles.

First, they note that in each city where neighborhood democracy succeeded, several conditions existed:

1. There was a political movement calling for neighborhood democracy.

2. There was a strong, early commitment from government officials to make the system work
3. There were significant powers given to neighborhood associations over important policy matters.
4. The boundaries of neighborhood institutions followed the existing "natural" patterns of neighborhoods.
5. The neighborhood associations received staff and other support sufficient to do a credible job.

A second area of concern are excessive expectations for neighborhood empowerment. Large claims lead to large disappointment. In his survey of citizen participation, Harrigan noted that "the most enduring were the moderate forms of control sharing." (1985:237) Harrigan also indicated that a study of neighborhood programs in the midwest showed that "neighborhood program participants expressed greater satisfaction with the program if it provided for only moderate levels of participation rather than high levels and if the program was of a moderate scope rather than a comprehensive scope." (237)

Within these moderate bounds, Harrigan concluded, citizen participation cannot be written off in the l990's:

> Some of its more moderate tenets (such as client representation and neighborhood advisory councils) are accepted practices in many cities today. Although these practices have not revolutionized the life-styles of urban dwellers, the practices often have modified the plans of big-city institutions to make them more accommodating to local residents (p. 237).

In his study of neighborhood power in Baltimore, Matthew A. Crenson (1983) argued that cities can become more governable through the involvement of neighborhoods:

> In some instances, central authorities have exhibited a remarkable willingness to delegate decision-making powers to neighborhood institutions. Their willingness to do so does not signify that urban executives are so indifferent to the importance of their own powers that they would casually surrender them to amateurs in the provinces. Instead, they seem to regard decentralization as a means for avoiding some of the localized troubles that incessantly interrupt the orderly conduct of business at headquarters and hamper the exercise of central authority. (299)

Citizen participation in the 1990's is a more moderate, stable phenomenon compared to the big battles of the 1960's and 1970's. While there are cities that have had significant success, there have also been cities that have not succeeded in making it work. For every New York City, where community boards have been reasonably successful, there are other cities that have not managed to make participation work. Ross and Levine (1996) concluded that:

> The most serious problem remains largely unsolved: how to devolve meaningful administrative authority to field offices and power to citizens while at the same time retaining a substantial element of policy-making and oversight control. This issue is one of the critical problems facing local government. (243)

These observations suggest that the expectations for what neighborhood empowerment can accomplish must be modest. They will not create a revolution. They

will not turn the system upside down. They will not replace representative government. They will not end inequality of power. If they are done poorly or without enthusiasm, they will certainly fail, and make things worse. But if done well, the research seems to show that citizen participation may make a democratic system function better.

To make citizen participation work in Los Angeles will require a careful investigation of the Los Angeles political setting, and a thoughtful analysis of the various methods by which this city can incorporate the involvement of the widest possible spectrum of the citizenry.

There are critical choices ahead that we will consider in coming weeks:

1. Is neighborhood democracy desirable and feasible in Los Angeles government?

2. Is there public support for neighborhood democracy?

3. Is there sufficient support for neighborhood democracy among elected officials and within the bureaucracy?

4. If neighborhood democracy is developed in Los Angeles,

   * how should neighborhoods be defined?
   * should neighborhood bodies be elected or appointed?
   * should neighborhood bodies have advisory or other powers, and over what issues?

5. How can we evaluate neighborhood democracy in Los Angeles?

Sources:

Berry, Jeffrey M., Kent E. Portney, and Ken Thomson. 1993. The Rebirth of American Democracy. Washington, DC (Brookings Institution).

Crenson, Matthew A. 1983. Neighborhood Politics. Cambridge, MA (Harvard University Press).

Harrigan, John. 1993. Political Change in the Metropolis. New York, NY (HarperCollins College Publishers).

Bernard H. Ross and Myron A. Levine. 1996. Urban Politics: Power in Metropolitan America (5th Edition). F.E. Peacock.

A decentralized city government, with considerable authority placed in the hands of the neighborhoods, represents a sensible compromise between the realistic needs of efficiency and scale for some services and the requirements of participatory democracy. Neighborhood-based government draws easily on people's sense of identity with the area they live in. People know they are going to have frequent interactions with their neighbors, so even if they attend meetings infrequently they have a powerful incentive to think about long-term relationships in addition to the policy questions at hand. The primary decisionmaking tool in neighborhood associations is, quite simply, discussion among the community residents who attend the regular open meetings. Thus neighborhood associations are institutions that are well suited to the face-to-face interaction that can nurture cooperative behavior.

Neighborhoods and Participation

This book is a study of five cities that take face-to-face democracy seriously. In these cities neighborhood organizations are the primary agent of political dialogue and citizen influence. This type of neighborhood system is a significant step toward strong democracy. And the systems work.

Each city has built a system of support and policy connections around the following neighborhood groups.

—Birmingham has a three-tiered system in which neighborhood officers in over ninety-five neighborhoods are elected every two years at the polls. The neighborhood associations form the base of the system. Broader "communities" encompass several neighborhoods apiece, and a citywide Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) is composed of representatives from each of these communities. Each association communicates with all households in its neighborhood through a monthly newsletter, decides how its community development block grant (CDBG) allocations will be used, and works with community resource staff to find solutions to neighborhood concerns. This structure was the first to bring blacks and whites in Birmingham together in a common vision for the city.

—Dayton has a system of seven Priority Boards whose members are elected by precinct through the use of mail ballots. Each Priority Board area is divided into neighborhoods, which overlap the precinct boundaries. The system is seen explicitly as a two-way communication channel between government and citizens. Through leadership training; a

monthly council meeting of each board and representatives of major city agencies; annual neighborhood needs statements; and a wide range of neighborhood-oriented planning, initiatives, and self-help programs, citizens learn how to make their voices heard. In return, the city communicates its plans and progress to all the neighborhoods through a Priority Board staff based in a neighborhood office and makes its case for needed change on a wide range of matters from bond issues to city employee residency requirements.

—Portland has grown into a citywide system of autonomous neighborhood associations, with seven District Coalition Boards pulling together more than ninety neighborhood representatives. Each board, hiring its own staff and working out of its own office, is under contract with the city to provide "citizen participation services" to its own community. The administrative budget alone was more than $1.2 million in 1986–87. The system consciously balances the coalition advocacy, annual neighborhood needs reports, crime prevention teams, and individual neighborhood issues with a wide range of citywide participation initiatives. These initiatives include Budget Advisory Committees for every major agency plus the "big BAC" for the city as a whole, comprehensive neighborhood-based planning, self-help development grants, technical assistance, and a citizen mediation program. City officials take pride in the multiplicity of participation routes.

—St. Paul is divided into seventeen District Councils, each elected by residents of the council area. Every council has a city-paid community organizer and neighborhood office, but virtually all other efforts come from volunteers or additional funds raised by the council itself. The District Councils have substantial powers, including jurisdiction over zoning, authority over the distribution of various goods and services, and substantial influence over capital expenditures. A citywide Capital Improvement Budget Committee (CIB), composed solely of neighborhood representatives, is responsible for the initiation and priority ranking of most capital development projects in the city. Community centers, crime prevention efforts, an early notification system for all major city agencies, and a district newspaper in virtually every council area help to make the system one of the most coherent and comprehensive of any city we have seen.

—In San Antonio, Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) is structured along parish boundaries of the Catholic church in the Hispanic sections of the city. Parallel but much weaker organizations exist in the remainder of the city, competing with independent neighborhood

organizations. Citywide conventions and "actions" (demonstrations, meetings, and confrontations with public officials) of several hundred to several thousand people characterize COPS activity. The city initiates fewer programs in support of the neighborhood groups than do the other four cities, but over the course of twenty years, COPS has provided the Hispanic community, which had virtually no clout at city hall, with an organization that arguably has more political power than any other single community group in the nation.

In contrast to the critics' predictions, these strong participation systems have not functioned at the expense of governability. They do not produce policy gridlock or increased political conflict. The systems do not seem to introduce racial or economic biases into the policymaking process. There is no evidence that the city-supported neighborhood associations at the core of the systems in four of the five cities are less effective in translating citizen demands into governmental action than are independent citizen groups.

Instead of chaos, there is a degree of empowerment. Participation in these systems tends to increase confidence in government and sense of community. Within a certain range of issues—particularly land use and planning issues—neighborhoods generate city policy. High levels of face-to-face participation are linked to increased responsiveness by city hall.

After many years of operation, however, many participants and nonparticipants alike have criticisms of these systems. Some feel that they do not go far enough: the city does not listen to them on the important issues, the participation structures have become rigid, and too few people are involved. Indeed, our comparison surveys show that the overall numbers of people active in their community are little different in these cities from those in comparable cities with less extensive participation efforts, although more of this activity in the five cities is directed toward community and political issues than purely social interaction. Low-income people and those with lower education levels are still much less involved than higher income, more highly educated people. Many remain unaware of an opportunity to participate and skeptical of their ability to influence any political decision. Even the five cities are still far from achieving the ideals of strong democracy.

To explore the potential and realities of systems promoting strong participation, we constructed a multifaceted research design combining both surveys and fieldwork in the five cities. Our approach can only be described in the briefest of terms here; readers who want to know more

DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OF THE CITY CHARTER

Representative	**Selection of City Officers** • *At-large elections*: Mayor, City Attorney, Controller, and Board of Education. [6] • *District elections*: Fifteen Council seats and seven Board of Education seats. [6 (2) (a), 20] [255.1] • *Four year terms*: Mayor, Councilmembers, Controller, and Board of Education. [7] • *Limited to two terms*: Mayor, Councilmembers, City Attorney, and Controller. [7.5] • Council authorized to adopt election code. [303] • Campaign contribution limits. [312] **Policy-making** Charter grants legislative powers to the City Council, and rule-making authority to City commissions and to General Managers who are department heads (subject to Mayor's approval).
Direct	**Selection of City Officers** • *Recall* of elected and appointed officials. [290-299] **Policy-making** • *Initiative*: Citizens may go through the Charter-prescribed process to petition the Council to approve a proposed ordinance. The Council shall approve the proposal or submit it to a vote of the people. [272-276] • *Referendum*: Most Council ordinances, orders, and resolutions require voter approval if a petition is filed within 30 days of the Council action. [280-289] *In addition, the Charter provides for voter approval of certain policies, many of which pertain to public enterprises.* For example: Transfer of Harbor District lands requires voter approval Certain actions regarding water and electric power require 2/3 vote of the electors.
Participatory	**Selection of City Officers** • *None* **Policy-making** • *Public meetings*: Council, Board of Education, and City commission meetings must be public. [22, 74, 75 (d), 258, 347] • *Public posting*: Ordinances do not become valid until publicly posted or published in newspaper. [31] • *Public complaints*: Mayor receives complaints against city officers and employees. [40 (3)]

Participation Study Group

Summer Schedule

June 25	
July 2	Hearing, east side of Los Angeles
July 9	Participatory Democracy in Los Angeles -- Case studies of LA
July 16	Geographies of Los Angeles -- Con Howe, Director of City Planning
July 23	A Forum on Representative Democracy
July 30	Representative Democracy, Part II (or, A Forum on Direct Democracy)
August 6	Study Group Workshop -- Options Report preparation
August 13	General Meeting: Study Group Reports

LOS ANGELES: WORK STILL TO BE DONE

Final Report of the
Los Angeles City Charter Commission

Los Angeles, California
December 1970

December 1970

Honorable Sam Yorty, Mayor
Honorable Council
City of Los Angeles

Gentlemen:

Our Commission is pleased to present this, its final report. The report marks the conclusion of our work on revising the city charter.

This November third a new city charter draft was on the ballot. Despite the fact that the new charter was not approved by city voters, it represented the most successful effort to accomplish major charter revision in Los Angeles in forty-five years. After repeated attempts and failures to get charter revision on the ballot, this year after a four-year effort, the voters were finally given an opportunity to express themselves.

The defeated charter would have been a significant general upgrading of the organization and clarity of the existing charter. It would have accomplished significant governmental changes. Most of these changes corresponded to proposals made by our Commission. There were, however, several Commission recommendations that would not have been implemented.

In sum, the City was close to success in trying to accomplish governmental improvement, but even if the Council's draft had been approved, some important work would still have remained.

We believe that our Commission has served out its usefulness to the City. Accordingly, we have asked the Mayor to discharge the Commission, and he has done so. The task remains, but new approaches must be pursued.

Trying to bring about governmental change is both stimulating and draining. It requires courage and perseverance, expends energy and time. Our Commission met ninety-seven times in the course of its work. There are, however, tremendous compensations. Doing a charter study is probably the best means of observing and gaining a real understanding of democratic and governmental processes. It affords an appreciation of the rigors of service as an elected public official. It also provides exposure to the complexities facing the managers charged with running the big business of city government.

This report includes impressions and judgments about the city government as we have observed it. Addressed to the public at large, these observations may be especially helpful in future efforts to bring about governmental change.

We want to express our thanks to all those who worked for charter revision in the past four years. It has been a privilege for us to have participated in this important civic effort. We are hopeful that governmental improvement will come in the form of major charter change. It is our sincere desire that our work and the unsuccessful campaign for a new charter will provide a foundation for future success.

LOS ANGELES CITY CHARTER COMMISSION

Henry Reining, Jr., Chairman

Francisco Bravo, M.D., Vice Chairman

Connie Friend

Jack K. Horton

Yosh Inadomi

Harold Jaeger

pay; (1) for the services rendered them by the city government, (2) amounts in lieu of taxes, (3) repayments on city general obligation bonds used for original capital funding for the departments, and, (4) a fair return on investment.

Control over salaries is important to the capacity of the independent departments to carry out their operations. On the other hand, the existence of more than one salary setting authority in the City creates personnel problems. This conflict should be resolved by assuring that common classes will be paid the same throughout the city government.

The changes that would have been effected by the Council's charter were minor compared to the fundamental issue of independent budgetary control. Any future charter revision should continue the independent budgetary powers of the proprietary departments. It is equally important that these independent departments adopt a view of overall charter revision that is broader than that guided by their own narrow interests.

THE CITY AS A DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTION

The purpose of the City as a democratic institution is to translate the diverse needs and demands of citizens, groups, and communities into public services, improvements,

and programs. This is accomplished through the political process.

9. Representation, Citizen Access, and Participation

Is the City's basic representation system sound? Is there adequate access to the city government for information and the communication of needs and grievances? Is there sufficient opportunity for citizen participation and involvement in the city government on both the city-wide and local neighborhood levels? Should the method of electing the Los Angeles Board of Education be controlled and changed by the city charter?

Commission Recommendation

The Commission recommended in its April 1970 report that the Council be expanded from 15 to 17 members. This was in addition to the previous suggestion that Council districts be apportioned on the basis of population rather than registered voters. It was proposed that the charter contain standards of conduct for officers and employees and that the Council and departmental boards be required to provide agenda for their meetings at least forty-eight hours in advance.

The Commission recommended that existing election machinery be simplified and that certain

changes be made to facilitate the participation of citizens in city elections. One was a provision for the occupations of candidates to appear on the ballot. Another was a requirement for the Council to provide for the printing of some ballots and voter pamphlets in Spanish.

The Commission proposed the establishment of an office of Ombudsman to process citizen complaints, maintain a central grievance file, and provide a governmental referral service. It was suggested that the city adopt a "responsible city" concept of municipal government service. This would have been carried out via an information referral and follow-up service. Such service would have been directed at increasing the accessibility and adequacy of public services from all jurisdictions on behalf of Los Angeles citizens.

The Commission recommended that the charter enable the formation of Neighborhood organizations with elected boards and appointed Neighbormen. This proposal was directed at the problems related to the City's tremendous size and physical decentralization. Local communities within the City lack the means for communicating with, participating in, and contributing to the large-scale centralized government.

The Commission also recommended that the composition and method of electing the Board of Education be changed in ways designed to make it a more representative and effective governing body.

Council Charter

When the Council's charter was placed on the ballot, it was accompanied by an amendment providing for an expansion of the Council from 15 to 17 members. This amendment required a separate vote and would only have become effective if both it and the charter had been approved by the voters. The Council's charter also provided for the apportionment of Council districts on the basis of population rather than registered voters. Standards of conduct for city officers and employees were not specified in the Council's charter. There was no requirement for providing agenda in advance of Council and board meetings. Election provisions were simplified, but no provisions were made for having the occupations of candidates on the ballots or for the printing of some election materials in Spanish.

The Council's charter would not have established a citizens complaints officer, provided for the maintenance of a central grievance file, or instituted

a governmental referral service. No provision was made for the formation of Neighborhood organizations or boroughs. The composition and method of electing the Board of Education would not have been changed. The issue of whether the city charter or State laws govern the method of electing the Board of Education would not have been resolved.

Discussion

As a unit of local government, Los Angeles will progress or decline on the strength or weakness of its political process. The concern, activism, and movement now evident in many of the City's communities and organizations should be made a vital part of that process. To facilitate this, there must be many avenues for communication and participation in the city government.

Under the present system, such avenues are limited. One Councilman who has 200,000 constituents and several communities to serve is not enough, even with a sizable staff. The existing community organizations are helpful, but, because they tend to have specific areas of concern, they are not enough. New mechanisms and approaches to community and citizen participation must be found if our supercity is to be governable. Such new means must be institutionalized and made part of a total governmental system. The Council and the Mayor must

remain the principals in the political and representational process, but they must have a greater variety of sources of two-way communication to provide a broader base for governmental action.

Any future charter revision effort should address these needs directly. Despite the fact that this whole area presents problems that are difficult to deal with for elected officials, it is this area that will be most critically in need of attention during the 1970's.

Concerning the method of electing the Board of Education, there remains legal confusion about whether the city charter or State law governs. This permits the Board to disclaim accountability to either the city electorate or the State Legislature. It is essential that this important function be governed by a representative and accountable body.

PERSONNEL

The personnel function is an important element of city administration. It substantially determines the quality of the city's work force and greatly influences the effectiveness and cost of the city government.

10. Civil Service and Salary Setting

Should detailed civil service procedures be specified in the charter? What mechanisms should