

REPORT OF THE CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

DATE: March 4, 2026
TO: Honorable Members of the Transportation and Public Safety Committees
FROM: Sharon M. Tso *SMTso* Assignment No. 25-07-0581
Chief Legislative Analyst Council File No. 20-0875
SUBJECT: Unarmed Traffic Response Programs in Comparable Jurisdictions

SUMMARY

On November 30, 2023, Council received the recommendations of the Traffic Alternatives Project, findings from an Advisory Task Force established by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) that met from June 2022 through September 2023 to convene community meetings and make recommendations for traffic safety alternatives based on community needs.

Subsequently, at its meeting on June 12, 2024, Council adopted a joint Transportation and Public Safety Committees report relative to the Traffic Enforcement Alternative Project (Attachment A) that made numerous requests to evaluate police traffic stop practices in Los Angeles. This report addresses Instructions Six and Eight by focusing on comparable jurisdictions that have evaluated pilot programs for alternative traffic enforcement models.

No jurisdiction in California has allowed civilians to enforce moving violations of the Vehicle Code because such a policy would violate State law. Instead, some jurisdictions across the United States have implemented programs, typically housed within police departments, that authorize civilian personnel to respond to specified non-emergency calls, including non-injury traffic collisions, blocked driveways, and noise complaints.

Multiple jurisdictions across the United States have placed limitations or outright bans on when peace officers can initiate traffic stops. Such policies generally preclude peace officers from initiating traffic stops for certain “low priority” Vehicle Code violations. Lower priority Vehicle Code violations typically include expired registration, improper registration plate display, and unlit tail lights during daytime hours, among others.

SB 50 (Bradford), introduced in December 2022, would have granted local jurisdictions in California the authority to enforce certain violations of the Vehicle Code through employees who are not peace officers. This legislation failed and no successor legislation is currently pending consideration in the State legislature. Other jurisdictions contacted by our Office indicate the failure of SB 50 precluded implementation of relevant reforms.

AB 2773 (Holden), placed additional restrictions on police activity during traffic stops and has been effective since January 2024. AB 2773 requires peace officers conducting traffic or

pedestrian stops to state the reason for the stop prior to engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation. This information is currently integrated with data reporting requirements required under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015.

BACKGROUND

Members of communities across the country have expressed concern with the manner and frequency with which peace officers have initiated traffic stops for perceived minor infractions. Highly publicized, deadly encounters with members of the public for what many perceived to be minor legal violations in 2020 and 2021 led communities across the United States to pursue policies to remove armed law enforcement personnel from traffic stops. In addition to legislative action that sought to remove peace officers from traffic stops, many jurisdictions have placed limitations on law enforcement initiating traffic stops for certain “low-level” Vehicle Code violations.

The cities of Berkeley, CA, and Brooklyn Center, MN, were widely considered to be the “first movers” of policies that contemplated creating a civilian traffic enforcement unit that would remove peace officers from conducting traffic stops.¹ Staff from both cities have informed our Office that relatively small measures have been taken and that sworn personnel are still conducting traffic stops as of February 2026. Obstacles toward deploying a civilian traffic enforcement unit include, but are not limited to, relevant State law and budgetary constraints.

The cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, PA, have placed explicit limitations on when peace officers can enforce the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code for certain Secondary, or “low level” violations, which include citations related to the inadequate display of license plates, an expired emission inspection, or an obstructed registration tag, among others. The California Vehicle Code would need to be amended to allow cities to adopt similar bans.

California Senate Bill 50 (Bradford)

SB 50 (Bradford) was introduced on December 5, 2022, and would have limited traffic stops across California while also authorizing local jurisdictions to enforce nonmoving or equipment violations of the Vehicle Code through government employees who are not peace officers.

The proposal precluded peace officers from stopping or detaining the operator of a motor vehicle or bicycle for a low-level infraction, unless a separate, independent basis for a stop existed or more than one low-level infraction was observed. “Low-level infractions” were defined as any of the following and did not include violations relating to commercial vehicles:

- 1) Registration of a vehicle or vehicle equipment;
- 2) Positioning or number of license plates when the rear license plate is clearly displayed;

¹<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/safe-streets-for-all-an-opportunity-to-rethink-traffic-enforcement/>

- 3) Vehicle lighting equipment not illuminating, if the violation is limited to a single brake light, headlight, rear license plate, or running light, or a single bulb in a larger light of the same;
- 4) Vehicle bumper equipment; or,
- 5) Bicycle equipment or operation.

SB 50 would have also authorized a peace officer's agency, if a peace officer did not have grounds to stop or detain the operator of a motor vehicle or bicycle and the officer could identify the owner of the vehicle, to mail the owner or send a warning letter identifying the violation and instructing the owner to correct the defect or otherwise remedy the violation.

Proponents of the legislation argued that law enforcement misused minor vehicle equipment violations to conduct otherwise illegitimate traffic stops, while opponents claimed that SB 50 jeopardized public safety by depriving peace officers of an effective investigative tool. SB 50 was ultimately ordered to the State inactive file in September 2023 and subsequently died on the inactive file in November 2024.

Assembly Bill 2773 (Holden)

AB 2773 (Holden) was chaptered in September 2022 and has been effective since January 1, 2024. The legislation requires a peace officer making a traffic or pedestrian stop to state the reason for the stop before asking any questions related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation, unless the officer reasonably believes that withholding the reason for the stop is necessary to protect life or property from imminent threat.

Information regarding the stated reason for the stop is currently integrated with other data reporting requirements required under State law.²

Berkeley, CA

On July 14, 2020, the Berkeley City Council passed an omnibus Motion, referred to as "Safety for All: The George Floyd Community Safety Act," that instructed staff to pursue the creation of a Berkeley Department of Transportation (BerksDOT) to "ensure a racial justice lens in traffic enforcement" and develop transportation policies and infrastructure to identify and implement approaches that reduce and/or eliminate the practice of pretextual stops based on minor traffic violations. The Motion included \$150,000 to hire a consultant to conduct a data-driven analysis of police calls and responses to determine the quantity and proportion of calls that can be responded to by non-police services.

In addition to instilling a racial justice lens in transportation programs and services, the omnibus Motion's stated purpose was to "separate traffic enforcement from the police," "reduce traffic enforcement as a tool for enhancing traffic safety," and to shift traffic enforcement, collision response, and parking enforcement away from peace officers.

² <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/regulations>

The omnibus instructions have since been incorporated into the City of Berkeley's Reimagining Public Safety (RPS) initiative, which has gone through multiple changes. First, the BerkDOT proposal has been paused and its funding deferred. It is unclear if the BerkDOT proposal will be renewed in the near future. City of Berkeley staff have communicated to our Office that the failure of SB 50 in 2023 was a major reason for the proposal pause and funding deferral of BerkDOT.

The Berkeley Police Department has continued to conduct traffic stops throughout the City. Official statistics indicate that approximately 4,500 traffic stops were initiated in 2025, less than half of the nearly 11,000 conducted in 2019.³

Brooklyn Center, MN

Following the police killing of Daunte Wright in May 2021, Brooklyn Center, MN, a Minneapolis suburb of approximately 35,000 residents passed a resolution in 2021 that sought to remove traffic enforcement from peace officers. Brooklyn Center was one of the first jurisdictions to evaluate unarmed civilians performing traffic enforcement, and was hailed as a "Model for Reexamining Public Safety," by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).⁴ The proposed reforms included precluding peace officers from initiating traffic stops for multiple vehicle code violations, such as inoperative vehicle mufflers, non-functioning license plate lamps, invalid or expired trailer or motor vehicle registration, and improperly displayed registration stickers.

Our Office met with Brooklyn Center's Chief of Police to discuss the unarmed civilian traffic reforms since May 2021 to incorporate civilians into performing traffic stops. In that meeting, the Chief of Police communicated to our Office that very few reforms have been implemented since 2021. New City Council members, obstacles pertaining to State law, and community members concerned with traffic safety and parking violations have stalled the originally proposed reforms. As of February 2026, peace officers in Brooklyn Center, MN, are performing enforcement of the Minnesota Vehicle Code.

Oakland, CA

Oakland, CA's, Reimagining Public Safety Task Force (RPSTF), which was active from September 2020 through March 2021, was formed to reconstruct the public safety system in Oakland by developing recommendations for Council consideration to increase community safety through alternative responses to calls for assistance. The RPSTF was comprised of two co-chairs, two co-facilitator organizations and 17 appointed members.

On March 10, 2021, the RPSTF adopted 88 recommendations, which included proposed reforms such as reducing the number of peace officers, replacing peace officers with civilian staff and

³ <https://bpd-transparency-initiative-berkeleypd.hub.arcgis.com/pages/stop-data>; <https://bpd-transparency-initiative-berkeleypd.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/3c9b2272178549698b3fde550ca33ba9/about>

⁴ <https://www.aclu.org/news/criminal-law-reform/brooklyn-center-provides-a-model-for-re-examining-public-safety>

reassigning their functions to other departments, and reducing peace officer overtime. As of July 2025, Oakland has 686 peace officers, down from 723 in 2021.

Peace officers are still performing traffic stops in the City of Oakland as of February 2026. Official statistics note that approximately 10,000 individuals were subject to a traffic stop between January 2025 and June 2025. Although complete 2025 traffic stop figures are still pending, they are expected to exceed 2019 levels, when nearly 15,000 people were stopped.⁵

Philadelphia, PA

In May 2019, Philadelphia voters approved Philadelphia Question 4, which created a new class of unarmed law enforcement officers called “public safety enforcement officers” to assist the police department in regulating traffic and enforcing code provisions. Public safety enforcement officers primarily assist the Philadelphia Police Department with traffic regulation, including directing traffic during peak hours, and do not have arrest or detention powers.

Public safety enforcement officers have been expanded to 125 civilians and have been primarily tasked with directing traffic and ordering the removal of abandoned vehicles from city streets. Such positions are intended to allow peace officers more time to perform core policing duties while maintaining safety and traffic order. The Philadelphia Police Department has continued to conduct traffic stops throughout the City. Official statistics indicate that approximately 220,000 vehicle and pedestrian investigations were initiated in 2025, a nearly 55 percent decrease from 2019.⁶

Since 2021, the City of Philadelphia, PA, has implemented multiple measures that restrict traffic stops and expand the use of civilians in some roles within the Philadelphia Police Department. The expanded roles occupied by Philadelphia Police Department civilians, however, do not include initiating traffic stops because those enforcement duties are reserved for peace officers.

Effective since February 24, 2022, Philadelphia’s Driving Equity Law was passed to “clarify the appropriate methods and circumstances” of traffic enforcement violations in order to provide for the “fair and transparent administration” of traffic violations, “prevent racial disparities,” and protect public safety.⁷ The law identifies eight (8) secondary Pennsylvania Vehicle Code violations that cannot be used to initiate a motor vehicle stop unless there is a simultaneously-observed primary violation⁸ for which an officer could issue a citation.

The secondary Vehicle Code violations are identified as follows:

⁵ <https://www.oaklandca.gov/Public-Safety-Streets/Police/OPD-Data/Data-from-Police-Officer-Visits-and-Stops/2025-Jan-Jun-Stop-Data>

⁶ <https://data.phila.gov/visualizations/vehicle-pedestrian-investigations>

⁷ City of Philadelphia Bill No. 210636-A

⁸ Primary Pennsylvania Vehicle Code violations include, but not are limited to, Driving Under the Influence (DUI), speeding, and holding or using an interactive mobile device while driving.

- 1) Vehicle registration, when the vehicle had been previously registered within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania within sixty days of the observed infraction;
- 2) Temporary registration permits, where the violation is related to the location of the permit but the permit is otherwise clearly displayed in the rear window;
- 3) Display of registration plate, where the violation pertains to a plate not securely fastened to the vehicle but such plate is otherwise clearly displayed;
- 4) Periods for requiring lighted lamps, where the violation for lighting equipment not illuminating is limited to a single brake light;
- 5) “Other obstruction,” which include objects or materials hung from the inside rearview mirror that obstruct the driver’s vision through the front windshield;
- 6) Vehicles without front and/or rear bumpers, unless the motor vehicle was originally manufactured without them or exempt as certain agricultural or special equipment;
- 7) Operation of vehicle without official certificate of inspection; and
- 8) Unlawful operation of vehicle without evidence of emission inspection.

Pittsburgh, PA

Following Philadelphia, PA, the city of Pittsburgh, PA, also adopted an ordinance precluding certain violations that can be used to initiate a traffic stop. Effective April 29, 2022, the law mirrors the Philadelphia ordinance and includes multiple sections with identical language. The law identifies eight (8) secondary Pennsylvania Vehicle Code violations that cannot be used to initiate a motor vehicle stop unless there is a simultaneously-observed primary violation.

Long Beach, CA

Our Office met with Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) staff to discuss Community Services Assistants (CSA), which are unarmed civilian employees that perform non-sworn, service-oriented duties related to law enforcement. Non-sworn law enforcement duties include, but are not limited to, responding to non-emergency calls for service relating to parking violations, noise complaints, and burglaries where the suspect is no longer on site.

In that meeting, LBPD personnel communicated to our Office that peace officers are generally very supportive of CSAs because they allow sworn personnel to focus on more serious crimes and emergencies, which has reduced response times to lower-priority calls. CSAs carry pepper gel and respond to calls for service in white, city-decaled vehicles while wearing a grey polo shirt and black pants. As of February 2026, there are approximately 30 CSAs within the LBPD along with roughly 800 sworn personnel.

NEXT STEPS

The City may consider implementing an analogous program to the CSAs currently employed by the LBPD. CSAs are required to have either one year of experience involving a substantial amount of public contact or one year of education in criminal justice, social service, or a closely related field and a valid motor vehicle operator license. CSAs receive four weeks of classroom training along with 3 months of field training, which is conducted by a variety of sworn officers

and professional staff. Many of the current CSAs were former parking enforcement personnel in the Long Beach Public Works department.

If the Council wishes to pursue such a policy, staff should be instructed to prepare relevant documents that outline the scope of the proposed policy to assess financial costs, departmental and community impacts, and performance measures for Council consideration.



Henry Flatt
Analyst

Attachments:

- A. Transportation and Public Safety Committees Report

File No. 20-0875

TRANSPORTATION and PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEES REPORT relative to the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Project.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. INSTRUCT the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), with the assistance of the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BOE), the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services (BSS), the Department of City Planning (DCP), City Attorney and in consultation with racial justice and equity advocates, to report in 90 days on how to develop and implement self-enforcing infrastructure as part of The Healthy Streets LA ballot measure (HLA) implementation plan (Council file Nos. 24-0131 and 24-0173) and future Mobility Plan, Community Plan, and other specific plan and overlay zone updates with said report to include a plan to evaluate self-enforcing infrastructure projects to quantify the impacts to public safety after a project has been implemented, as well as development of a multi-departmental disciplinary team that includes racial justice and equity advocates, safe streets advocates, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), to develop standards and review self-enforcing infrastructure projects.
2. INSTRUCT the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) and the City Administrative Officer (CAO), in consultation with the LADOT, the BOE, the City Attorney, the LAPD, other relevant departments, community experts, and other members of the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Advisory Task Force, to report in 90 days an evaluation criteria matrix that analyzes the impact of non-moving and equipment violations, and moving violations on traffic safety, and identify what violations that do not pose a demonstrative public safety threat or concern.
3. REQUEST the LAPD Inspector General to report in 90 days on:
 - a. An evaluation of the 2022 pretextual stop policy, including all available data on all traffic stops conducted since the 2022 policy change. This report should also include an analysis of pending state legislation that would have the potential to ban or curtail pretextual stops, as well as information on other jurisdictions that have banned or significantly reduced pretextual stops.
 - b. All oversight protocols law enforcement officers are required to follow at all stages before, during, or after a traffic stop. The report should include a list of all traffic safety reasons why law enforcement would currently pull someone over, as well as the prioritization for handling traffic safety issues
4. INSTRUCT the LADOT, Community Investment for Families Department (CIFD), and the CAO to report in 90 days on Council file No. 23-1189 (Soto-Martinez – Harris-Dawson – Hutt – Lee) as part of the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Project

(Council file No. 20-0875), which requires report consistent with the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Advisory Task Force recommendations and discussions with respect to Fines and Fees, Adjustments, Alternative Methods, and the potential for a Fines and Fees Task Force. This report should, in addition to addressing budgetary impacts, include who sets the fee or fine, if the local government has the ability to create an alternative or adjustment, and whether a low income or unhoused program can be created or expanded. The report should also include an analysis of the traffic citation processing contracts as well.

5. INSTRUCT the CLA, in collaboration with the CAO, the LADOT, the City Attorney, the LAPD, any other relevant departments, community experts, and other members of the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Advisory Task Force, to report with an assessment of the fines and fees models for vehicle citations, in connection to Council file No. 23-1189, and all types micro-mobility vehicles and devices in the City of Los Angeles and determine an equitable, means-based model to issue fines and fees. The report should also investigate the following:
 - a. Other comparable municipalities that have implemented alternative models for fines and fees.
 - b. Provide recommendations on a framework to create a revolving door fund that earmarks a proportion of the fines and fees revenue for a vehicle repair voucher, clinic program, and Traffic school voucher program.
 - c. Curate a criterion of motorists that could qualify.
6. INSTRUCT the CLA and the CAO, with assistance from the LADOT, City Attorney, the LAPD, and other relevant departments to report in 90 days with an analysis of other comparable jurisdictional programs and municipalities that have initiated pilot programs, frameworks, and alternative programs to traffic enforcement models that utilize care-centered teams and unarmed civilians for traffic safety issues such as, but not limited to Berkeley, CA; Oakland, CA; Pittsburgh, PA and Philadelphia, PA. The report should focus on the steps necessary to allow unarmed civilians and care-based teams to undertake traffic enforcement and traffic safety, published evaluations of the impact of these programs, cost, size and safety considerations.
7. INSTRUCT the LADOT to report with an analysis of other jurisdictions, including but not limited to Indianapolis, IN, that have cross-disciplinary crash review teams who investigate all serious crashes in order to recommend infrastructural interventions that would prevent future crashes.
8. INSTRUCT the CLA, in collaboration with the Personnel Department, CAO, and City Attorney, and with assistance from the LADOT, to report in 90 days on required measures to implement an unarmed civilian and care-based teams focused exclusively on road safety and responding to traffic-related calls, including crash investigations. The report should include the following information:

- a. Define the feasible roles and responsibilities of these unarmed civilian and care-based teams, specifying their contributions to enforcing traffic safety and responding to traffic-related calls.
 - b. Clarify the parameters and limitations with establishing these teams in alignment to State law.
 - c. Identify any existing classification (e.g. the Crisis Response workforce) eligible for reclassification within the City to form the unarmed civilian and care-based teams, along with a suitable department that could house these personnel, such as the Office of Unarmed Response or LADOT.
 - d. Conduct an analysis of necessary steps to developing a new classification for unarmed civilian and care-based teams and the additional components, such as training, certifications, and other resources that would be required for these personnel.
 - e. Administer a cost-benefit analysis between using existing structures and classifications or creating new classifications for the unarmed civilian and care-based teams.
 - f. An estimation of the size of the workforce needed for citywide implementation based on the information garnered from the findings.
 - g. Convene with relevant labor unions on the feasibility of both the creation of a new classification and use of existing classifications.
9. INSTRUCT the CLA, in collaboration with the LAPD, City Attorney, and any other relevant department, to report in 90 days on the existing moving and non-moving equipment and administrative violations applicable to all types of micro-mobility modes of transportation (e.g., scooters, bicycles, etc.) and direct impact on mitigating traffic safety concerns. This analysis should include how each micro-mobility mode of transportation is classified and cited, and any potential recommendations to reform the interaction and citation processes for micro-mobility modes of transportation.
10. INSTRUCT the CLA, with assistance from the LAPD, CAO, City Controller, and any other relevant agencies, to report in 90 days with an analysis of pretextual stops and citations disaggregated by the following criteria:
- a. Types of vehicles (make, model, and year)
 - b. Corrective action pursued, such as if the driver received a citation, warning, or any other action
 - c. Council District

d. Census Tracts

11. INSTRUCT the LADOT, with assistance from the Department of Public Works, the LAPD, and any other relevant agencies, to report with a definition of a “Self-enforcing Infrastructure” score or filter for public right-of-way design elements. The report should also define what data would be used to prioritize the implementation of design elements which would include a “Self-enforcing Infrastructure” lens (or a higher-scoring “Self-enforcing Infrastructure” lens) over design elements that would not include a “Self-enforcing Infrastructure” lens or would have a lower-scoring lens.
12. INSTRUCT the LADOT, the LAPD, and any other relevant agencies to collaborate with the University of California Davis, Institute of Transportation Studies’ analysis of police stop data, roadway infrastructure and vehicle crashes, and to identify any additional research questions needed, if any, to evaluate the relationship between distinct moving violations, the locations they have occurred, the underlying roadway conditions, and crash patterns adjacent to nearby said locations as a City of Los Angeles-led effort. Whereas the “Alternative to Traffic Enforcement and Community Task Force Recommendations” report identified the relationship between traffic stops and the High Injury Network in the aggregate, this, deeper review, would build upon that work and look at distinct locations and corridor segments.
13. REQUEST the City Attorney, in coordination with their Risk Management Division and LAPD General Counsel, to report on the state laws that govern traffic enforcement, including who may enforce and what types of enforcement they may conduct, as well as the liability and risk exposure that could result from unarmed or civilian enforcement.

Fiscal Impact Statement: The LADOT reports that there is no fiscal impact.

Community Impact Statement: Yes

For:

Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council
Los Feliz Neighborhood Council
North Westwood Neighborhood Council

Summary:

On December 6, 2023, the Transportation Committee considered a November 30, 2023 LADOT report relative to the Traffic Enforcement Alternatives Project. According to the LADOT, in February 2021, Council directed the LADOT, with assistance of the CAO, CLA, LAPD, and the City Attorney to develop and issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking a consultant to conduct a study on the feasibility of utilizing civilian enforcement of traffic laws for motorists, cyclists, and other forms of transportation occurring within the City.

They specified that the RFP considers existing state and local laws, existing best practices, and the size and diversity of the City.

In addition to the RFP, Council directed the LADOT to convene an Advisory Task Force to make recommendations to the City for traffic safety alternatives and convene community meetings to solicit feedback in regards to community needs. The LADOT received funding in the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 budget to issue the RFP and manage a consultant contract.

In partnership with the LAPD, CAO, CLA, and the City Attorney, the LADOT released a TOS in August 2021, selected a consultant team led by Estolano Advisors in February 2022, and began soliciting for advisory task force participation. The project kicked off in March 2022 and the advisory task force began meeting in June of that year. From June 2022 until September 2023, the Consultant team facilitated a series of Task Force meetings with the support of a City working group that included LADOT, CAO, CLA, LAPD, and the City Attorney. While the Consultant team led the qualitative and quantitative analysis, the Advisory Task Force informed and ultimately approved the final recommendations included in the report. The task force finalized their recommendations in September 2023, and Estolano Advisors submitted the final deliverables (i.e. report) to the City in November 2023. After consideration and having provided an opportunity for public comment, the Committee moved to continue the matter.

Subsequently, on February 21, 2024, the Transportation Committee once again considered this matter and a further continued this matter. On April 3, 2024, the Transportation further considered this matter and after further consideration and having provided an opportunity for public comment, moved to make a series of recommendations that are detailed above.

On June 11, 2024, the Public Safety Committee considered this item and after consideration and having provided an opportunity for public comment, moved to concur with the Transportation Committee. This matter is now submitted to Council for its consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,
Transportation Committee

COUNCILMEMBER VOTE

HUTT: YES
PARK: YES
HERNANDEZ: YES
RAMAN: ABSENT
YAROSLAVSKY: YES

Public Safety Committee

COUNCILMEMBER VOTE

RODRIGUEZ: YES
LEE: YES
PARK: YES
PRICE: YES
SOTO-MARTINEZ: YES

ARL
6/11/24

-NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL COUNCIL ACTS-