#97

LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: CALIFORNIA'S HIDDEN GOVERNMENT

July 1989

State of California

George Deukmejian, Governor

Little Hoover Commission

1303 J Street, Suite 270 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) 445-2125

Nathan Shapell
Chairman

Haig G. Mardikian
Vice-Chairman

Alfred E. Alquist
Senator

Mary Anne Chalker

Albert Gersten

Richard E. Gulbranson

Milton Marks
Senator

Gwen Moore
Assemblywoman

George E. Paras

Abraham Spiegel

Barbara S. Stone

Richard R. Terzian

Phillip D. Wyman
Assemblyman

Jeannine L. English
Executive Director

July 18, 1989

The Honorable George Deukmejian
Governor of California

The Honorable David A. Roberti
President pro Tempore of the Senate
and Members of the Senate

The Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
and Members of the Assembly

The Honorable Kenneth L. Maddy
Senate Minority Floor Leader

The Honorable Ross Johnson
Assembly Minority Floor Leader

Dear Governor and Members of the Legislature:

California's multi-level, complex governmental structure today includes more than 400 boards, commissions, authorities, associations, councils and committees. These plural bodies operate to a large degree autonomously and outside of the normal checks and balances of representative government.

Following an extensive study, the Little Hoover Commission has determined that the state's boards, commissions and similar bodies are proliferating without adequate evaluation of need, effectiveness and efficiency. This lack of control may cost the state not only dollars, but also wasted resources, duplicated efforts and the adoption of policies that may run counter to the general public's interest.

The Commission's study is the third it has conducted on the use of plural bodies in California state government. The first concerned boards and commissions in the Resources Agency (April 1965) and the second considered those in the predecessor to the Department of Consumer Affairs, the Department of Professional and Vocational Standards (September 1967).

The Commission initiated this third survey primarily because the number of state entities has grown substantially in the last 20 years and a comprehensive listing of those organizations does not currently exist. Also, since the previous studies focused on specific segments of state government, the Commission felt a statewide review concerning the roles, functions, staffing and budgets of all of these organizations would be useful.

The Commission began its survey of boards and commissions[1] in October 1988. We solicited information from all of the organizations that could be identified. In addition, we held a public hearing on February 24, 1989, at which testimony was received on the roles, functions and monitoring of the state's boards and commissions.

The Commission found that more than 400 such organizations exist in statutes, ranging from obscure bodies like the Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind (with half a staff person and a budget of $41,000) to entities with immense power and effect, such as the State Board of Equalization (3,183 staff, $153,860,000). The 361 organizations that responded to our survey as of June 30, 1989, are responsible for more than $1.9 billion of the 1988-89 state budget. In addition, more than 3,650 members are appointed to these bodies by the Governor, the Legislature or other mandated entities.

Although the findings and recommendations apply to all levels of extra-governmental bodies, the Commission chose to focus for the most part on the types of boards and commissions that have proliferated at the fastest rate in recent years: those with budgets under $5 million. These relatively small organizations account for more than $142 million of the annual $1.9 billion budget. Staffing ranges from zero to 115 state employees.

After reviewing data and testimony, we found that very few organizations were subjected to a systematic evaluation of need based on specific standards and criteria prior to their creation (a "sunrise" process). As a result, the State cannot be assured that the most appropriate structure has been created to address the perceived short- and long-term concerns.

Our study also revealed that a requirement does not exist to evaluate these organizations subsequent to their creation and,

---

[1] Committees, councils, authorities and associations in many instances perform autonomous functions similar to those of boards and commissions. Such bodies are included in this study; however, to simplify the discussion, the generic phrase "boards and commissions" is used to cover all plural, appointed bodies.

therefore, only a small number of them are ever reviewed. Some of the statutes creating these organizations contain "sunset" provisions terminating their operation after a set amount of time, but even in these cases the Legislature often extends their existence without any formal review of past operations or future needs, purpose or direction. The result is that some bodies continue to exist even after they no longer have any budget, staff or useful function.

Finally, the Commission also found that some of these organizations perform similar functions. This overlap in responsibilities at times leads to conflict between the organizations. Since there is not a single agency responsible for overseeing these various entities, coordination may often be minimal or even non-existent.

To address these concerns, the Commission's report presents several recommendations. These recommendations include:

* Developing and using specific "sunrise" criteria for evaluating the most effective way to address a problem before a new state organization is created.

* Including a specific "sunset" clause in the statutes for each newly created and existing entity. This provision should automatically repeal the enacting legislation, require a review of operations by an outside organization, and require the Legislature to take positive action if it wishes to extend the life of the "sunsetted" organization.

* Assigning responsibility for creating and maintaining a database of statutory boards, commissions, authorities, associations, councils and committees to a single state entity.

* Reviewing entities having similar functions to determine if consolidation of those responsibilities would be more efficient and economical.

The remaining sections in this report provide details of the study approach, background information, a discussion of the findings and detailed recommendations for addressing the issues identified.

Study Approach

An initial listing of boards and commissions was developed by soliciting information from the Governor's appointments secretary, the state budget, the state telephone directory and numerous other sources. Each of the identified organizations was sent a letter requesting specific information (See Appendix A for

the questionnaire). The information received became the basis for creating a computer database.

Organizations that were not statutory were excluded from this survey, as were federal, multi-state and private entities. A total of 402 qualified entities were identified in the course of this study. Appendix B lists selected data from each of the 361 organizations that responded to the survey by June 30, 1989. Appendix C lists the 41 organizations that did not respond.

The database, created from the surveys, was used to make limited reviews and comparisons between the various organizations. The data in the surveys was not systematically audited or verified by us with the exception of our review of the statutes.

Data provided by responding agencies may not in some cases match that provided in the Governor's Budget for the same fiscal year. For instance, a spot check of survey responses shows the Fish and Game Commission reported 6 staff and $319,106 while the Governor's Budget shows figures for the same year of 8.2 staff and $461,000. The California Arts Council reported 51 staff and a budget of $3,898,000 while the Governor's Budget shows figures for the same year of $15,529,000 and 54.8 staff. In the latter case, the Council did not report grant money as part of their budget.

Background

The executive branch of California state government is generally organized into separate agencies grouped by functional areas. Each of these agencies are segregated into departments. These organizations have secretaries or directors appointed by and responsible to the Governor.

Separate divisions, bureaus, boards and commissions with specific responsibilities exist within each of these organizations. The divisions and bureaus are directly under the control of the department director. However, the boards, commissions and authorities are more autonomous. The department director exerts control only through indirect mechanisms, such as influence, advice, administrative support services or budgetary means.

In addition to the agencies, the executive branch contains several constitutional officers, including the Secretary of State, the Treasurer, the Controller, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Attorney General. Each of these officers has specific mandated responsibilities. Separate boards

and authorities exist within some of these constitutional offices.

In addition to the pyramid-style organization described above, the Governor, the Legislature and the state's Constitution have established several organizations that are not under the direct control or authority of the Governor. Higher education, for instance, falls under the Board of Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State Universities, and the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges.

Other similar organizations created by the Legislature or by voter-approved initiatives to perform specific responsibilities include the California Transportation Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, the California Lottery Commission and the Fair Political Practices Commission. While the Governor and the Legislature are responsible for the appointments to these bodies, the boards remain largely autonomous in their actions.

The 1988-89 Governor's Budget contains more than 90 boards, commissions and authorities that are specifically listed and funded. These organizations may be funded in a variety of ways, including appropriations from the general fund, special taxes levied on the public or fees from specific groups or individuals. Others are funded through the budgets of various agencies and/or departments. In the course of this study, the Commission has identified more than 400 boards, commissions, committees, councils, associations and authorities that operate autonomously to some extent from the control of the executive and legislative branches of government.

Types of Boards and Commissions

Boards and commissions fall into four basic categories: advisory, regulatory, administrative and marketing orders. Some entities may have responsibility for more than one type of function. For instance, the Public Utilities Commission (with 1,057 staff members and a budget of $71,868,000) is a regulatory commission with oversight for utility rates. At the same time, the PUC has administrative responsibility for certain statutory programs regulating intrastate transportation. But most organizations fall clearly into one of the four categories, which are described below:

Advisory: The advisory bodies are created to provide appropriate input on particular issues. For example, the Advisory Commission on Special Education advises the executive and legislative branches of government on the educational needs of individuals with exceptional needs and recommends educational services and budget priorities. This commission, with a budget of

$119,156 and one staff person, is a separate entity and is governed by 17 appointed commissioners.

Regulatory: The regulatory bodies are charged with oversight responsibilities for particular occupations or industries. These responsibilities may include establishing legal qualifications for licensing practitioners of certain occupations, enforcing regulations, governing operations and promoting particular practices.

For example, the Board of Examiners of Nursing Home Administrators (four staff, $371,000) sets minimum requirements for entering the occupation, conducts licensing examinations, issues licenses, defines violations of the regulations and imposes disciplinary actions on nursing home administrators. Although this board is part of the Department of Consumer Affairs, the board operates autonomously and its decisions are not subject to the direct approval of the Department Director.

Administrative: The administrative bodies cover a wide variety of responsibilities. They may be organizations designed to increase public awareness of particular issues, such as the California Arts Council (51 staff, $3,898,000) or the Commission on the Status of Women (12 staff, $711,200). The California Governor's Committee for the Employment of Disabled Persons (no staff, $47,207) focuses its attention on promoting employment of the disabled.

Some administrative bodies may have more narrowly defined duties. One of the California Tahoe Conservancy's responsibilities is to restore portions of the Lake Tahoe Basin in an attempt to improve the ecological balance (13 staff, $1,476,000).

Also falling into the administrative group are the many authorities within the state government. The primary responsibility of these authorities is to provide financing for specific types of projects through the sale of bonds and tax-exempt notes. For instance, the California Educational Facilities Authority (two staff, $191,093) oversees the issuance of tax-exempt revenue bonds to assist private institutions in the construction and expansion of non-sectarian educational facilities.

Marketing Orders: State legislation provides for the establishment of various self-help, industry-government marketing programs, known as marketing orders, councils and agricultural commissions. Once a vote of those in the affected industry has been conducted, producers and handlers are assessed fees to create a marketing order program. The program may provide for advertising and sales promotion; research into production, processing and distribution methods; the establishment of quality

standards accompanied by an inspection program; supply management (no current marketing orders manage supplies); and the prohibition of unfair trade practices. California has marketing orders covering products as diverse as beef, pistachios, lettuce, beans, tomatoes, citrus, celery and artichokes.

Using these definitions, we reviewed the 361 organizations in our database, categorizing each entity by the main thrust of its duties and dealing separately with those organizations with budgets in excess of $5 million:

Boards and Commissions by Function

Type (Under $5 million)	Quantity	Budget	Staff
Advisory	53	$ 8,172,539	103.7
Administrative	182	$ 45,852,829	491.2
Regulatory	56	$ 53,664,703	763.5
Marketing Orders	34	$ 34,938,155	0.0[1]
Subtotal	**325**	**$ 142,628,226**	**1,358.4**
Over $5 million	36	$1,760,015,422	19,536.4[2]
Total	**361**	**$1,902,643,648**	**20,894.8**

As the chart shows, the largest number of boards and the second largest budget expenditure among the small bodies is in administrative entities. Although sources of funds vary, these administrative organizations, along with the advisory bodies, are the most likely to be budgeted out of the state's General Fund. (Regulatory organizations tend to be self-supporting through the

---

[1] Staff of marketing order-style entities are not considered state employees.

[2] Some entities reported staffing and budget for the whole organization while others reported only staffing and budget limited to the ruling body. See Appendix B for details.

collection of licensing and professional fees, while marketing orders are completely funded by the industries involved.) Thus, the administrative and advisory bodies in our survey represent a potential drain of up to $54 million from the General Fund.

Organizational Structures

Simply because an organization is titled as a board, commission, authority, association, council or committee does not indicate that other similarly titled organizations bear any structural resemblance. The terms all appear to be used generically and the title does not indicate a particular type of operation or specific responsibilities.

For example, while most authorities are financing conduits, the Emergency Medical Services Authority (10 staff, $1,413,000) is responsible for the coordination and integration of all state activities concerning emergency medical services. The Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority (two staff, $484,000) serves as the Civil Addict Program Paroling Board for the Department of Corrections.

Turning to boards, the Board of Podiatric Medicine and the Board of Medical Quality Assurance regulate specific groups of health care practitioners within the Department of Consumer Affairs. Another health care regulating entity, the Board of Chiropractic Examiners is not even located within the Department of Consumer Affairs and is not subject to the oversight of any administrative agency, including the Department of Health Services.

Similar differences can be noted for commissions. The California Transportation Commission (12 staff, $1,385,000) has the authority to select transportation projects worth billions of dollars and funded through a variety of government revenue sources. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Commission has one staff person and a budget of $554,628, solely paid by private contributions. The Fish and Game Commission (6 staff, $319,106) formulates policies with the broad-ranging mandate of protecting all of California's natural resources and oversees the policies of the Department of Fish and Game. The State Historical Resources Commission (zero staff, $9,192), within the same agency, has a much narrower focus, developing criteria and making recommendations regarding historical structures.

Wide differences exist, therefore, in the budgets, staffing, responsibilities and legal authority of similarly titled organizations. But underlying the creation of these disparate boards and commissions typically are similar goals, as earlier Little Hoover Commission studies found.

Considerations for Establishing Boards and Commissions

The Commission's 1965 and 1967 studies identified certain valid purposes for establishing boards and commissions:

* Encouraging broader participation in government by citizens who would not otherwise be actively involved.

* Allowing the airing of competing or differing viewpoints in open forums.

* Bringing together a group of informed and responsible citizens to deliberate and seek a consensus.

* Insulating executives from undue pressure from special interests.

* Reducing the possibility of arbitrary action by an executive official.

While these worthy purposes make clear the utility of creating extra-governmental bodies in some cases, our prior studies also outline reasons to exercise restraint or caution in the use of boards and commissions:

* The more people involved in the decision-making process, the more difficult it becomes to fix responsibility for results. Executives at times "use" a board to avoid responsibility.

* A plural body by its very composition cannot decide or act as expeditiously as a single executive.

* Where authority is shared between one or more bodies and executives, a consistent and coordinated line of action is difficult to maintain.

* Special interest representatives on a board may have an undue influence that is contrary to the general public interest.

* Boards may be expensive due to the members' compensation and expenses, staff time to prepare for meetings and respond to requests, and duplication of staffing with the related executive agency.

* Boards tend to become isolated from the normal governmental processes of legislative policy formulation, executive leadership and administrative and fiscal audit control.

These reasons for avoiding the creation of independent bodies were summarized succinctly in our 1965 report:

"The total cost of board and commission operation cannot be measured but may be considerable. To the extent that these bodies are influenced by special interests, obscure responsibility and function free from certain of the restraints or checks exercised over executive agencies generally, their actions can commit the State to substantial expenditures not carefully related to overall financial plans or priority schedules."

Using the above information and guidelines, the Little Hoover Commission reviewed the existing processes for creating, operating and eliminating boards and commissions in general. The overall pattern that emerges reflects a lack of oversight and, potentially, a lack of control.

Findings

FINDING #1: STATUTORY BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AUTHORITIES, ASSOCIATIONS, COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS ARE CREATED WITHOUT ANY SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE APPROACH TO SOLVING THE PERCEIVED PROBLEM.

The Legislature and the governor routinely create new entities without first determining the most appropriate methodology to correct whatever the perceived problem is. More than 400 of these independent organizations are currently in existence.

The creation of new entities, even when filled with public-service-oriented citizens "donating" their time, is not without cost. Each organization either has budgeted staff or receives some staff support from an oversight department. Further, costs are generally incurred for equipment, stationery, supplies, space and furniture for the new entity. In addition, many of the boards and commissions have members who are paid to attend meetings and, in some, cases, are paid salaries. To the extent appropriate analysis and evaluation have demonstrated the need for the entity's creation, these costs are legitimate. However, rarely is a systematic analysis performed.

Although the state for the most part has no guidelines or criteria to be used in the creation of boards and commissions it is not because such standards do not exist or would be too difficult to formulate. In the case of regulatory bodies, the Center for Public Interest Law at the University of San Diego (among others) has analyzed the effectiveness of different levels of regulation in reaching the goal of protecting the public and promoting the general public interest. The Center has outlined a two-step process for reaching a decision to regulate the marketplace:

1. Precisely identify the flaw that the creation of a body is supposed to solve.

2. Consider the wide spectrum of alternatives that would address that flaw, ranging from the "carrot" (such as tax incentives) to the "stick" (such as criminal prohibitions), with a middle ground of mandated disclosure statements, bond requirements and licensing, permitting or certifying. The efficacy, costs and benefits of each alternative in relation to how it meets the need pinpointed in step one must be weighed.

In testimony to the Little Hoover Commission, the Center cautioned that licensing should be viewed as an extremely restrictive step because it forbids people from freely entering the marketplace to offer their services by requiring them to meet certain criteria and pay certain fees. The Center believes licensing should only be chosen as a regulating mechanism when three conditions exist:

1. There likely would be irreparable harm to the public without prior restraint of the occupation.

2. The prior restraint is designed in such a way that it is precisely directed at the possible harm and will lessen its likelihood.

3. The prior restraint is the most cost-effective means of lessening the harm.

The Center finds either a permit process or a certification process less restraining than a licensing program but still of value to consumers. Under the certification level, a practitioner can advertise himself as state-certified after completing a state-sanctioned process, but can practice his vocation without certification. The permit system allows the state to keep track of practitioners without performing any weeding out process, although permits can be revoked if standards are violated.

Thus the three levels of direct state regulation--licensing, certification and permitting--work to protect the

general public at different levels and in different ways without creating monopolies or cartels.

The state already has made tentative steps toward setting up a systematic, analytical process for evaluating the creation of new regulatory bodies. In 1987, the Department of Consumer Affairs began using a "sunrise model," based on concepts that are similar to those set forth by the Center for Public Interest Law. Advocates for a potential new licensing category must complete a detailed questionnaire based on nine sunrise criteria if they want support from the department:

> 1. The practice of the occupation would harm or endanger the public health, safety or welfare if it were not closely monitored and regulated.
>
> 2. Existing protections available to the consumer are insufficient.
>
> 3. No alternatives to regulation will adequately protect the public.
>
> 4. Regulation will mitigate existing problems.
>
> 5. Practitioners operate independently, making decisions of consequence.
>
> 6. Functions and tasks of the occupation are clearly defined.
>
> 7. The occupation is clearly distinguishable from other professions that are already regulated.
>
> 8. The occupation requires possession of knowledge, skills and abilities that are able to be taught and tested.
>
> 9. The economic impact of regulation is justified.

The Department of Consumer Affairs evaluates the questionnaires to determine whether the department should

support the creation of the new regulatory body. As of February 24, 1989, 13 requests for this evaluation had been received and three had been completed. The Department opposed the creation of new regulatory bodies in two of the cases; subsequently, legislation either died or was modified so that no new body was created. In the third case, the concerns are being addressed through the regulatory process of an existing body rather than with the creation of a new entity.

While these results show that the process can work, the fact is that the Department's sunrise process is only advisory, not mandatory. Organizations that hope to gain the support of the Department must be evaluated, but legislation still can create regulatory bodies despite the outcome of the evaluation.

While the sunrise model focuses primarily on the need for regulatory activity, it could be expanded to include advisory and administrative bodies (since marketing orders are set up by election, they are evaluated by the voters involved). The model is also somewhat limited in that it deals with the question of need for a body, but does not address the best type of structure to achieve the desired goals. This, too, could be covered in an expanded version.

Despite its limitations, the sunrise model does force some level of analysis that currently rarely exists when most boards and commissions are created. Without such a model as part of the deliberative process, the Legislature and the governor may create organizations that are duplicative or inefficient. The potential result is wasted resources and a reduced opportunity to resolve issues.

FINDING #2: FEW ORGANIZATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO PERIODIC REVIEW SUBSEQUENT TO THEIR CREATION.

Fewer than 20 of the organizations responding to our survey have any requirement for subsequent evaluation of results or need for continued operations. This type of evaluation is important since the Legislature created these organizations to accomplish specific goals. Currently, once the organization has been created, the Legislature and the Governor usually rely on the budgetary process to determine if the goals are being met and if there is a need for continuing operations. This process does not necessarily evaluate results and accomplishments.

Even those organizations that are created with a sunset clause in the statute do not necessarily receive an evaluation. The "sunset" clause requires that the organization cease to exist at a specific point in time unless the Legislature and the governor act to extend the

life of the entity. While this forces government to take action to retain the organization, it does not provide for any systematic evaluation of accomplishments or continuing needs.

The Legislature and the governor regularly extend the life of these "sunsetted" entities, sometimes without including new sunset clauses in the statutes. For example, the Board of Landscape Architects (with a staff of two and budget of $586,000) successfully fought off efforts to sunset it last year. Even though the Department of Consumer Affairs supported ending operations for this board, the Legislature chose to continue its existence. While testimony was provided on the pros and cons, the Legislature did not have the benefit of an independent review of the board's operations.

When a body is created for a particular purpose, there is no need for its continuance once the task is completed. The continuation of it can be costly, may obscure responsibility and may complicate administration. Depending on budgetary review to determine the continued operations of an existing board or commission is not always sufficient.

An entity can be denied funding, but that does not guarantee its demise. The board can continue to meet and conduct business without a budget. An example is the Public Broadcasting Commission. Even though the Governor denied this commission funding three years ago, the commission continues to exist as a State entity. The State has not formally evaluated whether there is a continuing need for the commission to exist, or what the costs or responsibilities associated with its perpetuation are.

Several states require sunset clauses in the statutes for all new boards and commissions. These states have also created systems to ensure that a formal evaluation of results and mission occur prior to the sunset date. For instance, the State of Tennessee requires its state auditor to perform a sunset review on each organization periodically. The report is used by the Tennessee Legislature to determine the term or viability of the entity.

The State of Colorado has implemented a formal sunrise/sunset system. A sunset clause must be included in the statutes of each new entity. Prior to the date of sunset, the entity is required to provide to the Legislature documentation of specific criteria for continued existence. This formal review provides critical information that assists the administrator and legislators in assessing the results and accomplishments of the organization.

But the need for assessment extends beyond the sunsetting question. The effectiveness of an organization must be examined so that alterations, improvements or new strategies may be instituted. For instance, in 1986 the State directed a complete overhaul of the way the State Bar regulates the legal profession after deciding the Bar's disciplinary system was not working well.

But without a systematic process of evaluation, the state's ability to solve problems can be hit-or-miss and can take longer than necessary. As examples, the state's Solid Waste Management Board has been the target several times of legislative efforts to change the direction of California's waste disposal policies, including moves to circumvent the board by placing parts of solid waste programs under other entities. The state's Board of Medical Quality Assurance also has been the focus of criticism for not moving aggressively enough to police the medical profession. In neither case has a comprehensive review of the boards and their responsibilities been conducted.

Full-scale, periodic evaluations of the state's many entities would give the state a solid database of information for its policy decisions. Such reviews would also enhance the prospect that state policy, once decided, is carried out efficiently and effectively.

FINDING #3: SOME BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AUTHORITIES, ASSOCIATIONS, COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS HAVE OVERLAPPING FUNCTIONS.

Numerous organizations have been created that have similar functions. Sometimes the overlap is a product of the passage of time and changing conditions; in other instances, the overlapping functions may exist from the beginning.

For instance, the Department of Consumer Affairs has several licensing entities, all of which have responsibility for enforcing regulations: a single function shared by different entities. While some of the entities rely on the Department's centralized investigative unit, others have their own separate investigators. While these separate investigators may provide the entities with greater autonomy, they keep the state from taking full advantage of centralization.

The advantages to the state of using a central investigative unit are of two kinds: objectivity and economy. The investigators tend to be more objective in that they operate independently from the individual licensing boards and are less likely to be influenced by licensees. Moreover,

there are scales of economy in a large organization. Well-trained investigators operating regionally can more efficiently cover the investigations of several boards. In addition, consistent policies and investigative procedures can be developed and the quality of the investigative service may be enhanced. The state of New York has successfully used a single organization to handle enforcement for all the licensing entities.

As noted above, changes over time can also lead to overlapping responsibility. In April 1989, the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee approved AB 235, which would eliminate the California Lottery Commission, the California Horse Racing Board and the Attorney General's Gaming Registration Unit and put in their a place a new California Gaming Commission. The intent of the bill is to coordinate gambling regulation within the state, reduce conflict between separate agencies and provide for consistent policies. While these autonomous organizations were created at different times for different reasons, the bill's authors believe the public's interest would now be better served if they were combined into one comprehensive entity.

Other recent legislation has contemplated the elimination of the Franchise Tax Board and the Board of Equalization in favor of a new unified tax-processing agency. Combining existing entities, when feasible, may reduce the costs of administration while creating more comprehensive state policies.

As the roles of existing organizations expand, conflicts in policy and scope of authority occur more often. Areas of focus that may have seemed independent of each other a few years ago now seem to overlap.

For instance, the Air Resources Board, the State Water Resources Control Board and the California Solid Waste Management Board all are concerned with different aspects of protecting the environment, but they are finding a much greater relationship between their tasks than was originally envisioned. Individuals and organizations operating under the authority and rulings of these boards receive inconsistent guidance and direction when the boards cannot agree. Moreover, the state's goals for the environment might be better coordinated through more centralized means, keeping intact liaisons with local governments.

In some cases, conflicts in scope of authority lead to extreme consequences. For example, the Physicians Assistant Examining Committee and the Board of Pharmacy have turned to the courts to determine what type of work each licensee is authorized to perform. Potentially costly legal battles

between state agencies are not an effective use of the practitioners' or the state's money.

Without a comprehensive review of the state's critical policy areas and the current systems and organizations in place to address those areas, the state cannot be assured that the most effective and efficient systems are currently being used.

Conclusions and Recommendations

At a time when California is experiencing continued growth, escalating budget pressures and increasing needs for efficient governmental operations, it is vital that the state have a comprehensive means of organizing and monitoring the entities it creates. With more than 400 boards, commissions, authorities, associations, councils and committees already in existence, the state needs to rigorously question the creation of further separate bodies. In addition, the state should embark on an effort to effectively evaluate the present ones, eliminating those that are unnecessary or duplicative.

The Little Hoover Commission believes the following recommendations will aid the state in this endeavor:

1. The Governor and the Legislature should enact specific "sunrise" criteria to determine when autonomous bodies can be created and what form of body is most appropriate for different types of activities. The criteria should encompass the creation of regulatory, administrative and advisory types of functions.

2. The Governor and the Legislature should enact a statute that requires "sunset" clauses to be used whenever autonomous bodies are created and to be amended into the statutes authorizing existing entities. This "sunset" provision should set a date for the termination of an organization, require a review of operations by an independent organization and require the Legislature to take positive action to continue an entity's existence beyond the sunset date.

3. The Legislature should assign the Legislative Analyst responsibility for developing and performing sunset review procedures.

4. The Governor and the Legislature should direct the Department of General Services to create and maintain a database of all statutory boards, commissions, authorities,

associations, committees and councils. In addition, the Department would require each of these autonomous organizations to follow the state's standard administrative, budgetary, accounting and recordkeeping policies.

5. The Governor and the Legislature should direct the Auditor General to report on the benefits of combining any or all of the functions of regulatory entities into a single unit.

The Commission believes that the Governor and the Legislature should adopt the recommendations outlined in this report, thereby assuring the public that comprehensive, coordinated policies are being implemented in the most efficient and ethical manner.

Sincerely,

NATHAN SHAPELL, Chairman
Haig Mardikian, Vice Chairman
Senator Alfred Alquist
Mary Anne Chalker
Albert Gersten
Richard Gulbranson
Senator Milton Marks
Assemblywoman Gwen Moore
George Paras
Abraham Spiegel
Barbara Stone
Richard Terzian
Assemblyman Phillip Wyman

LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION
STUDY ON BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND AUTHORITIES
Organization Questionnaire

IDENTIFICATION:

Organization Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Zip Code _____

Telephone _____

Organization Primarily Advisory Yes _____ No _____

Contact Person _____

Title _____

Oversight Dept./Agency _____

FY 1988-89 BUDGET:

Salaries & Wages _____
Benefits _____
Board Compensation _____
Other Compensation:

_____ _____ Total _____

General Expenses _____
Facilities _____
Printing & Postage _____
Communication _____
EDP Costs _____
Consultant:
- Internal _____
- External _____

Central Administration _____
Travel:
- In-State _____
- Out-of-State _____

Equipment _____
Insurance _____
Training _____ Total _____
Other Expense:

_____ _____

_____ _____

ID # _____

FY1988-89 STAFFING: (List Highest Paid Positions First, Combine Remaining Positions)

Position Titles	Number	Compensation
Other Positions		

COMMISSIONER & BOARD MEMBER INFORMATION:

Number of Members _____
Length of Term in Years _____
Appointing Authorities:
- Governor _____
- Assembly _____
- Senate _____
- Other:
  - _____ _____
  - _____ _____
  - _____ _____

Conditions of Appointment:
- None _____
- Professional Expertise _____
- Position _____
- Interest Groups _____
- Other:
  - _____ _____

Compensation:
- Fee Authorized _____ Per _____
- Actual Fees _____ Per _____
- Travel Reimbursement Yes _____ No _____

Meetings:
- Required Frequency _____ Per Year
- Authorized to Request: _____
  _____

ID # ____

ROLE AND FUNCTIONS:

Statutes Creating:

_____ Year _____

_____ Year _____

Statutes Amending:

_____ Year _____

_____ Year _____

_____ Year _____

_____ Year _____

_____ Year _____

_____ Year _____

Statutes Sunsetting _____ Year _____

Codes:

Type	Beginning	Ending

FY 1987-88 Key Accomplishments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Funding Sources:

General Fund _____

Fees & Reimbursements _____

Other: _____

ID # ____

ADMINISTRATIVE ENITITES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-01A DISTRICT	$250,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-01st DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-02nd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-03rd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-04th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-05th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-07th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-09th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-10A DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-10th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-12th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-13th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-14th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-15th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-16th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-17th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-18th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-19th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-20th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-21A DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-21st DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-22nd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-23rd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-24A DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-24th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-25th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-26th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-27th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-28th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-29th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-30th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-31st DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-32nd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-33rd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-34th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-35A DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-35th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-36th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-37th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-38th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-39th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-40th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-41st DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-42nd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-44th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-45th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-46th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-48th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-49th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0

ADMINISTRATIVE ENITITES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-50th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-51st DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-52nd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-53rd DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
AGRICULTURE ASSOCIATION-54th DISTRICT	$85,000	9	0.0
ALAMEDA COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
AREA BOARD I ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$148,709	17	3.0
AREA BOARD II ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$159,933	14	3.0
AREA BOARD III ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$160,891	15	3.0
AREA BOARD IV ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$152,434	17	3.0
AREA BOARD IX ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$171,979	17	3.0
AREA BOARD V ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$156,269	15	3.0
AREA BOARD VI ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$130,685	15	3.0
AREA BOARD VII ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$150,166	17	3.0
AREA BOARD VIII ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILTIES	$160,799	19	3.0
AREA BOARD X ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$209,598	17	3.0
AREA BOARD XI ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$149,425	17	3.0
AREA BOARD XII ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$158,796	17	3.0
AREA BOARD XIII ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$161,087	19	3.0
BOARD OF CORRECTIONS	$3,994,000	11	43.0
BOARD OF FORESTRY	$374,433	9	3.4
BOARD OF GOVERNORS MARITIME ACADEMY	$8,000	7	0.0
BUTTE COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	$321,000	13	4.0
CALIFORNIA ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCE FINANCING AUTHORITY	$149,000	5	2.0
CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL	$3,898,000	11	51.0
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON AGING	$805,000	25	9.0
CALIFORNIA EARTHQUAKE SAFETY & HOUSING REHABILITATION FINANCE	$0	6	0.0
CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES AUTHORITY	$191,093	5	2.0
CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED PERSONS	$47,207	60	0.0
CALIFORNIA HEALTH FACILITIES FINANCING AUTHORITY	$781,635	9	1.0
CALIFORNIA HEALTH MANPOWER POLICY COMMISSION	$12,800	10	0.0
CALIFORNIA HOUSING BOND CREDIT COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION	$570,249	10	10.0
CALIFORNIA LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION & RENOVATION FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	3	0.0
CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD	$56,984	13	1.0
CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	$1,371,479	7	25.0
CALIFORNIA MORTGAGE BOND & TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE	$243,000	7	3.0
CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	4	0.0
CALIFORNIA OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE	$208,884	7	2.0
CALIFORNIA PASSENGER RAIL FINANCING COMMISSION	$0	4	0.0
CALIFORNIA POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY	$1,306,445	3	10.0
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FINANCE AUTHORITY	$85,317	3	1.0
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES	$120,669	24	1.0
CALIFORNIA STATE WORLD TRADE COMMISSION	$2,210,500	11	18.0
CALIFORNIA STUDENT LOAN AUTHORITY	$110,659	5	1.0
CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY	$1,476,000	7	18.0
CALIFORNIA TASK FORCE TO PROMOTE SELF-ESTEEM	$289,000	25	2.0
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	$1,385,000	11	12.0

ADMINISTRATIVE ENITITES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
CALIFORNIA URBAN WATERFRONT AREA RESTORATION FINANCING AUTHORITY	$20,623	5	1.0
CALIFORNIA WATER COMMISSION	$336,000	9	4.0
CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE, COASTAL, AND PARK LAND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	$0	3	0.0
CHEMICAL EMERGENCY PLANNING & RESPONSE COMMISSION	$1,101,000	16	23.0
CHOWCHILLA JUNIOR FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
CLEAN WATER AND WATER CONSERVATION FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
CLEAN WATER FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
CLOVERDALE CITRUS FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
COLORADO RIVER BOARD OF CALIFORNIA	$801,000	10	10.5
COMMISSION ON CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION & ECONOMY	$510,000	13	6.5
COMMISSION ON SPECIAL EDUCATION	$119,156	17	1.0
COMMISSION ON STATE FINANCE	$798,126	7	9.0
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES	$615,200	5	8.0
COMMISSION ON STATUS OF WOMEN	$711,200	17	12.0
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS	$41,548	16	1.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
COMMUNITY PARKLANDS PROGRAM FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	3	0.0
COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	4	0.0
EL DORADO COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AUTHORITY	$1,413,000	15	18.2
FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS POLICY COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP FINANCING AUTHORITY	$74,222	3	1.0
HEALTH SCIENCE FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	7	0.0
HOUSING COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
HUMBOLDT COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
INDUSTRIAL WELFARE COMMISSION	$409,950	5	4.6
INTER-MOUNTAIN FAIR OF SHASTA COUNTY	$85,000	9	0.0
JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COUNCIL	$869,539	32	11.5
LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	4	0.0
LASSEN COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
LODI GRAPE FESTIVAL	$85,000	9	0.0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FAIR	$250,000	9	0.0
LUPUS APPROPRIATIONS BOARD	$0	3	0.0
MARIN COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
MENDOCINO COUNTY FAIR & APPLE SHOW	$85,000	9	0.0
MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL	$166,828	15	4.0
MERCED COUNTY SPRING FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
MINING & GEOLOGY BOARD	$360,000	9	4.0
MOUNT SAN JACINTO WINTER PARK AUTHORITY	$0	0	0.0
NAPA COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
NATIONAL ORANGE SHOW	$150,000	9	0.0
NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION	$309,000	9	5.0
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE	$0	3	0.0
OFF-HIGHWAY MOTOR VEHICLE RECREATION COMMISSION	$62,783	7	1.1
ORGANIZATION OF AREA BOARDS ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$2,233,066	0	37.3
PARKLANDS PROGRAM FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0

ADMINISTRATIVE ENITITES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
PLACER COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
PLUMAS COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
PRISON INDUSTRY BOARD	$190,953	11	2.0
RECLAMATION BOARD	$259,000	7	3.0
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	$749,172	26	8.0
RIVERSIDE COUNTY'S NATIONAL DATE FESTIVAL	$85,000	9	0.0
SAFE DRINKING WATER FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
SALINAS VALLEY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
SAN BENITO COUNTY SADDLE HORSE SHOW, RODEO	$85,000	9	0.0
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY FAIR & FLOWER SHOW	$85,000	9	0.0
SAN MATEO COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
SANTA CLARA COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY	$303,493	9	9.0
SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION	$943,000	17	13.0
SENIOR CENTER FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	4	0.0
SOLANO COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
SONOMA COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION	$472,587	11	4.0
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
STATE COUNCIL ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	$1,015,450	17	13.0
STATE HISTORICAL RESOURCES COMMISSION	$9,192	9	0.0
STATE PARK & RECREATION COMMISSION	$119,190	9	2.1
STATE PARK & RECREATION FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
STATE RACE TRACK LEASING COMMISSION	$0	6	0.0
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	8	0.0
STATE TEACHERS RETIREMENT SYSTEM	$39,000	12	1.0
SUMMER SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS	$260,798	11	4.0
TRINITY COUNTY FAIR	$85,000	9	0.0
VETERANS BOARD	$121,000	7	1.0
VETERANS DEBENTURE FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	5	0.0
VETERANS FINANCE COMMITTEE OF 1943	$0	5	0.0
VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL COMMISSION	$554,628	9	1.0
WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	6	0.0
WATER CONSERVATION FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	6	0.0
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD	$581,000	3	9.0
	---	---	---
Totals	$45,852,829	1751	491.2

Source: Database Prepared by Karl Dolk, Technical Consultant

ADVISORY ENTITIES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
ADVISORY BOARD ON PRIVATE SECURITY SERVICES	$0	9	0.0
ADVISORY BOARD TO THE BUREAU OF HOME FURNISHINGS	$0	13	0.0
AGNEWS DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
AIDS VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION POLICY REVIEW TASK FORCE	$0	14	0.0
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR MENTALLY DISORDERED	$0	7	0.0
AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR ADVISORY BOARD	$0	9	0.0
BEVERAGE CONTAINER RECYCLING ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$144,996	12	1.5
BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON INMATE POPULATION MANAGEMENT	$208,089	25	3.0
BOATING & WATERWAYS COMMISSION	$24,200	7	0.0
CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM SERVICES	$0	11	0.0
CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMISSION	$1,181,000	9	11.5
CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY COUNCIL	$600	10	0.1
CALIFORNIA FAIR & EXPOSITION REVENUE BOND ADVISORY COMMISSION	$0	7	0.0
CALIFORNIA HEALTH POLICY & DATA ADVISORY COMMISSION	$283,570	13	2.0
CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCING ADVISORY COMMISSION	$363,000	5	4.0
CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION	$3,650,000	15	53.0
CALIFORNIA RECREATIONAL TRAILS COMMISSION	$3,500	7	0.1
CALIFORNIA STUDENT OPPORTUNITY & ACCESS PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$1,285	12	0.0
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL & DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL MENTALLY DISORDERED ADVISORY BOARD	$0	7	0.0
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$237,139	27	3.5
COLLECTION AGENCY BOARD	$0	7	0.0
DISPUTE RESOLUTION ADVISORY COUNCIL	$85,573	7	1.0
DISTRICT SECURITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$0	8	0.0
EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE	$82,725	13	0.0
ELECTRONIC & APPLIANCE REPAIR ADVISORY BOARD	$0	9	0.0
FAIRVIEW DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$401	9	0.0
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION	$2,923	16	1.0
LANTERMAN DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
LOAN STUDY COUNCIL	$13,362	16	0.0
LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT ADVISORY BOARD	$0	5	0.0
METROPOLITAN STATE HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR MENTALLY DISORDERED	$0	7	0.0
MUSEUM OF AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY & CULTURE ADVISORY BOARD	$1,311,629	7	16.7
NAPA STATE HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR MENTALLY DISORDERED	$0	7	0.0
PATTON STATE HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR MENTALLY DISORDERED	$0	7	0.0
PERSONNEL SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD	$0	7	0.0
PORTERVILLE DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
PROGRAM, POLICY & OPERATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$3,801	19	0.0
PUBLIC PROCUREMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$0	15	0.0
RESEARCH ADVISORY PANEL	$194,689	7	3.0
RESEARCH SCREENING COMMITTEE	$0	9	0.0
SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACID DEPOSITION	$0	9	0.0
SOCIAL SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD	$159,473	7	2.5
SONOMA DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
STATE BOARD OF FIRE SERVICES	$10,800	18	0.0
STATE BOARD OF FOOD & AGRICULTURE	$88,280	15	0.8
STATE TAX PREPARERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$0	9	0.0
STATE WORK-STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$2,864	18	0.0

ADVISORY ENTITIES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
STOCKTON DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD	$2,000	7	0.0
SUPPRESSION OF DRUG ABUSE IN SCHOOLS STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	$0	17	0.0
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY BOARD	$104,640	7	0.0
WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FINANCE COMMITTEE	$0	3	0.0
Totals	$8,172,539	546	103.7

Source: Database Prepared by Karl Dolk, Technical Consultant

REGULATORY ENTITIES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
ACUPUNCTURE EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$520,000	11	4.0
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL APPEALS BOARD	$459,575	3	3.2
ANIMAL HEALTH TECHNICIAN EXAMINERS COMMITTEE	$155,000	8	1.0
APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL	N/A	17	0.0
ATHLETIC COMMISSION	$908,000	8	26.0
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS	$4,398,000	10	48.0
BOARD OF BARBER EXAMINERS	$847,000	5	13.0
BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE EXAMINERS	$2,258,000	11	11.5
BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY	$3,326,000	7	42.0
BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS	$4,155,000	14	19.2
BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN VETERINARY MEDICINE	$155,000	6	5.0
BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF NURSING HOME ADMINISTRATORS	$371,000	9	4.0
BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS & EMBALMERS	$543,000	5	8.0
BOARD OF GUIDE DOGS FOR THE BLIND	$41,000	7	0.5
BOARD OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS	$586,000	7	2.0
BOARD OF OPTOMETRY	$591,000	9	3.5
BOARD OF OSTEOPATHIC EXAMINERS	$488,536	7	3.0
BOARD OF PHARMACY	$3,074,000	10	59.0
BOARD OF PILOT COMMISSIONERS	$445,000	7	1.0
BOARD OF PODIATRIC MEDICINE	$699,000	6	4.0
BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR GEOLOGISTS & GEOPHYSICISTS	$236,000	8	2.0
BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS	$3,544,000	13	55.0
BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION	$594,000	11	6.0
CALIFORNIA AUCTIONEER COMMISSION	$246,000	7	2.0
CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION	$4,207,000	15	115.9
CALIFORNIA DEBT LIMIT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE	$222,000	3	2.0
CALIFORNIA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD	N/A	7	6.0
CALIFORNIA WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD	$4,094,000	9	104.0
CEMETERY BOARD	$322,000	6	4.5
CENTRAL COAST REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS BOARD	$285,000	5	4.0
COASTAL CONSERVANCY	$2,744,000	7	41.0
COLORADO RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
COMMISSION ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS	$100,000	10	0.0
COMMITTEE ON DENTAL AUXILARIES	$1,063,000	9	2.0
FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING COMMISSION	$851,000	7	11.5
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION	$3,864,000	5	84.0
FISH & GAME COMMISSION	$319,106	5	6.0
HEARING & DISPENSER EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$403,000	7	3.0
LAHONTAN REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
LOS ANGELES REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
NARCOTIC ADDICT EVALUATION AUTHORITY	$484,000	7	2.0
NEW MOTOR VEHICLE BOARD	$977,223	9	11.6
NORTH COAST REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
PHYSICAL THERAPY EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$399,000	6	3.0
PHYSICIANS ASSISTANT EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$346,000	9	4.0
POLYGRAPH EXAMINING BOARD	$108,000	5	1.6
PSYCHOLOGY EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$1,148,000	8	6.0

N/A=not available

REGULATORY ENTITIES WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
REHABILITATION APPEALS BOARD	$158,183	7	3.0
RESPIRATORY CARE EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$600,000	9	7.0
SAN DIEGO REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
SANTA ANA REGION WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	$0	9	0.0
SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY EXAMINING COMMITTEE	$251,080	9	2.0
STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD	$2,079,000	7	16.5
	---	---	---
Totals	$53,664,703	458	763.5

Source: Database Prepared by Karl Dolk, Technical Consultant

MARKETING ORDERS WITH BUDGETS LESS THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
ALFALFA SEED PRODUCTION RESEARCH BOARD	$104,000	10	0.0
CALIFORNIA APRICOT ADVISORY BOARD	$358,351	19	0.0
CALIFORNIA ARTICHOKE ADVISORY BOARD	$350,480	19	0.0
CALIFORNIA AVOCADO COMMISSION	N/A	15	0.0
CALIFORNIA BEEF COUNCIL	$2,804,420	20	0.0
CALIFORNIA CLING PEACH ADVISORY BOARD	$1,287,922	25	0.0
CALIFORNIA DRY BEAN ADVISORY BOARD	$797,568	28	0.0
CALIFORNIA EGG COMMISSION	$255,200	8	0.0
CALIFORNIA FIG ADVISORY BOARD	$324,750	10	0.0
CALIFORNIA FRESH CARROT ADVISORY BOARD	$369,250	8	0.0
CALIFORNIA ICEBURG LETTUCE COMMISSION	$2,631,000	17	0.0
CALIFORNIA KIWIFRUIT COMMISSION	N/A	11	0.0
CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURING MILK PRODUCERS ADVISORY BOARD	$481,000	11	0.0
CALIFORNIA PISTACHIO COMMISSION	$3,043,175	9	0.0
CALIFORNIA RICE PROMOTION BOARD	$1,313,256	2	0.0
CALIFORNIA STRAWBERRY ADVISORY BOARD	$4,714,200	23	0.0
CALIFORNIA TABLE GRAPE COMMISSION	N/A	21	0.0
CALIFORNIA TURKEY INDUSTRY BOARD	$496,377	12	0.0
CALIFORNIA WALNUT COMMISSION	$3,169,558	11	0.0
CALIFORNIA WHEAT COMMISSION	$643,200	19	0.0
CALIFORNIA WILD RICE PROGRAM	$84,960	8	0.0
CANTALOUPE ADVISORY BOARD	$174,950	9	0.0
CELERY RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD	$217,652	11	0.0
CITRUS RESEARCH BOARD	$31,500	11	0.0
DAIRY COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA	$3,809,710	24	0.0
FRESH MARKET TOMATO ADVISORY BOARD	$769,250	17	0.0
HONEY ADVISORY BOARD	$108,500	10	0.0
ICEBURG LETTUCE ADVISORY BOARD	$511,625	15	0.0
MELON RESEARCH BOARD	$168,202	9	0.0
PEAR ZONE ADMINISTRATION	$634,625	13	0.0
POTATO RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD	$143,000	17	0.0
PROCESSING STRAWBERRY ADVISORY BOARD OF CALIFORNIA	$423,012	8	0.0
PROCESSING TOMATO ADVISORY BOARD	$2,474,462	10	0.0
RICE RESEARCH BOARD	$2,243,000	11	0.0
	---	---	---
Totals	$34,938,155	471	0.0

Source: Database Prepared by Karl Dolk, Technical Consultant

N/A=not available

ENTITIES WITH BUDGETS GREATER THAN $5,000,000

Organization	Budget	Members	Staff
AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	$6,260,000	5	102.9
AIR RESOURCES BOARD	$56,704,000	9	695.2
BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY	$5,537,000	12	24.0
BOARD OF CONTROL	$14,345,967	3	3.0
BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES	$13,077,000	15	213.3
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE	$15,988,000	19	163.0
BOARD OF PRISON TERMS	$13,747,957	9	135.7
BOARD OF REGISTERED NURSING	$8,246,000	9	82.0
BOARD OF VOCATIONAL NURSE & PSYCHIATRIC TECHNICIAN EXAMINERS	$23,879,000	11	29.0
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION	$32,501,000	5	431.3
CALIFORNIA EXPOSITION & STATE FAIR	$11,205,000	11	153.2
CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD	$9,800,000	7	56.0
CALIFORNIA MILK PRODUCERS ADVISORY BOARD	$19,406,000	25	0.0
CALIFORNIA PRUNE BOARD	$9,082,581	21	0.0
CALIFORNIA RAISIN ADVISORY BOARD	$21,137,000	16	0.0
CALIFORNIA STATE LOTTERY COMMISSION	$322,697,895	5	1097.4
CALIFORNIA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BOARD	$25,613,820	7	397.0
CALIFORNIA WINE COMMISSION	$6,867,871	18	0.0
COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING	$8,725,000	11	92.9
COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING	$10,626,000	17	104.0
CONTRACTORS STATE LICENSE BOARD	$43,814,658	13	601.0
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL	$7,090,983	7	67.1
FRANCHISE TAX BOARD	$157,599,200	3	3294.0
PRISON INDUSTRY AUTHORITY	$108,621,668	11	763.0
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT BOARD	$45,477,000	13	317.2
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD	$6,493,580	5	21.0
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	$71,868,000	5	1057.0
SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	$5,741,000	27	25.8
STATE ALLOCATION BOARD	$8,831,000	7	191.0
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION	$153,860,000	5	3183.0
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND	$313,548,242	5	4397.6
STATE LANDS COMMISSION	$16,376,000	3	224.5
STATE PERSONNEL BOARD	$24,681,000	5	317.2
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD	$129,505,000	86	1043.6
STUDENT AID COMMISSION	$23,177,000	15	220.0
YOUTHFUL OFFENDER PAROLE BOARD	$7,884,000	7	33.5
Totals	$1,760,015,422	452	19536.4

Source: Database Prepared by Karl Dolk, Technical Consultant

APPENDIX C

The following 41 entities did not respond to the Little Hoover Commission survey by June 30, 1989:

Advisory Board of Alcoholic Related Problems
Agriculture Bargaining Advisory Board
Alcohol, Drug and Traffic Safety Council
Board of Air Quality and Fuels
Board of Chiropractic Examiners
Block Grant Advisory Committee
California Advisory Council
California Bicentennial Commission on U.S. Constitution
California Emergency Council
California Film Commission
California Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board
California Victim Witness Judicial Council
Commission on Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials
Commission on Economic Development
Commission on Judicial Performance
Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education
Committee on Bar Examiners
Complaintents Grievance Panel
County Formation Review Board
Drug Programs Advisory Board
Export Finance Board
Foresters Licensing Board
Governor's Committee for the Employment of the Handicapped
Health Care Advisory Committee
Judicial Council of California
Minority Health Professions Education Foundation Board
Mt. San Jacinto Winter Park Authority
Museum of Science and Industry
Pooled Money Investment Board
Public Broadcasting Commission
Registered Dispensing Opticians Committee
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Task Force
Sir Francis Drake Commission
Small Business Advisory Council
Small Business Development Board
Southwest Border Regional Council
State Bar Board of Governors
State Bar Disciplinary Board
State Historic Building Codes Board
State Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Board
Tourism Commission

MILTON MARKS COMMISSION ON CALIFORNIA
STATE GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND ECONOMY
925 L STREET, SUITE 805
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814