

REPORT OF THE CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

DATE: June 10, 2026

TO: Honorable Members of the Rules, Elections, and
Intergovernmental Relations Committee

FROM: Sharon M. Tso 
Chief Legislative Analyst

Council File No.: 26-0489

Assignment No.: 26-06-0427

SUBJECT: 2026 Charter Reform Proposals

SUMMARY

On April 2, 2026, the City of Los Angeles Charter Reform Commission submitted their report containing recommendations for Charter amendments to the City Council for consideration. The report included proposed revisions to the Charter that address six key categories: planning, infrastructure, and parks; government structure; elections and democracy; ethics and accountability; neighborhood power; police and accountability; and budget, personnel and operations. It should be noted that the Commission did not prepare a fiscal impact analysis of their proposed amendments.

Following submission of the Commission report, the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee has held five hearings focused on consideration of the Commission's recommendations. Substantive public comment was received during those hearings, followed by review of the Commission's recommendations and discussion by the Committee. The Committee also considered Departmental suggestions and Council Motions for Charter amendments during their deliberations. Finally, during deliberations, Committee members identified additional Charter amendments for consideration. At each meeting, the Committee requested that the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) provide additional analysis of key issues. The CLA was then charged with producing a report incorporating analysis and recommendations concerning the Charter amendments under consideration.

This report begins with Table 1, which summarizes the issues under consideration for Charter amendment and the Committee's comments, and then recommends a disposition for each item. Table 1 is followed by more in-depth consideration of many of the issues and additional details concerning the recommended disposition of the items. Questions raised on individual proposals during the Committee hearings are addressed in this section of the report.

The next ballot available to present Charter amendments to the voters is November 3, 2026. To place measures on that ballot, Council would need to request the City Attorney to prepare the necessary documents for voter approval no later than June 17, 2026. It should be noted that the next regularly scheduled election will be the State Primary election in March 2028.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the City Council approve the following actions:

1. Adopt the disposition of Charter Reform measures as presented in Table 1;
2. REQUEST the City Attorney, with the assistance of the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) and the relevant departments, to prepare and present the documents necessary to place before the voters ballot language for the November 2026 ballot that would effectuate amendments to the Charter Sections identified in Table 1;
3. Request the City Attorney, with the assistance of the Chief Legislative Analyst, the City Administrative Officer, and any relevant departments, to prepare ordinances to amend the Los Angeles Administrative Code to implement measures as presented in Table 1; and
4. Instruct the CLA, CAO, and all relevant departments to prepare follow-up reports as identified in Table 1.
5. DETERMINE that the Floor Area Restriction Limitation Amendment (CRC 9) is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines sections 15378(b)(5) (organizational or administrative activities of governments) and 15061(b)(3) (common sense exemption).

FISCAL IMPACT

The Charter Reform Commission did not submit a Financial Impact Statement with their report recommending revisions to the City Charter, nor did they provide any financial assessment of the recommendations made. The Rules Committee has considered the Charter Commission's report, as well as Motions, Departmental proposals, and Committee proposals, many of which also have financial implications. The full Financial Impact cannot be fully evaluated until a final set of recommendations for Charter revisions has been approved, though it is clear that several recommendations would have significant fiscal impacts on the General Fund.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENTS

The following table summarizes the recommendations provided by the Commission, Council Motion, Departmental correspondence, and the Rules Committee. The table provides a short description of the proposed amendment, key notes from Rules Committee discussion, and a recommendation for disposition of the item. Attachment A includes a cross-reference between the Commission recommendations and Table 1 reference numbers. Attachment B provides a listing of opposition and support for the proposed Charter amendments by reference number.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
<i>Charter Reform Commission Recommendations</i>			
CRC 1	Empowers the Director of Public Works to manage the day-to-day operations of the Department of Public Works and all of its bureaus; supports the function of Citywide capital improvement planning; excludes the Director of Public Works from Transfer of Powers provisions	<p>Charter revision required. The Committee supported removing language from the Charter that specified the governance, management, and structure of the Department of Public Works in order to allow the City to define these structures and roles by ordinance. Analysis has not been conducted on the impacts of these changes to the governance of the Department of Public Works and its bureaus and concerns remain on impact to department operations.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Further study is required to assess the impacts of restructuring the Department of Public Works, including Board and Directors’ authority and responsibilities.</p> <p>Present to voters in November 2026 a Charter amendment to remove reference to the existing Bureaus of the Department of Public Works.</p>
CRC 2	Establishes a Capital Improvement Program with the Department of Public Works being the lead agency; Capital Improvement Program Plan shall span a minimum of five fiscal years and shall have identified and dedicated funding sources	<p>Committee supports establishment of a Capital Improvement Program in the Charter with details of the capital planning process, including the lead agency, to be established by ordinance. The Administrative Code currently requires an annual Capital Improvement Expenditure Program.</p> <p>Further changes can be made to the Administrative Code to reform the City’s capital planning processes.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Present to voters in November 2026.</p> <p>Upon voter approval, revise the Administrative Code.</p>

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 3	Dedicate a minimum of 2 percent of the City's budget to the Department of Public Works	<p>No Charter measure is required. Administrative Code and City Financial Policies can address the intent of this item. The Council and Mayor regularly dedicate well over 2 percent of the City Budget to the Department of Public Works.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact anticipated; City currently budgets more than 2% for Public Works.</p>	Note and File.
CRC 4	Increase the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) Charter-mandated minimum for the Department's budget to 0.065% of assessed property value	<p>Charter revision not required. Committee supports, with an implementation period of 4-6 years and an option for suspension in certain situations. CLA requested to provide language.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Will have a Fiscal Impact.</p>	Note and File. Alternatively, revise Administrative Code with amendments as discussed in this report.
CRC 5	Allows RAP to sell or transfer land that is not suitable for or determined to be a viable use for public recreation or open space; Approval of the sale or transfer can be done via the Board of Recreation and Park's determination, with the approval of the Council, OR by the Council through the adoption of a Motion.	<p>Charter revision required. Committee supports, with the inclusion of safeguard language governing the disposition of unusable Department-owned property. CLA requested to provide additional language.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: May have a Fiscal Impact depending on the specific parcels approved for sale/transfer.</p>	Further study is required.
CRC 6	Replaces the City's seven Area Planning Commissions (APC) and their 35	Charter revision required. The Committee did not take any action.	Note and File.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	<p>Commissioners with a new Neighborhood Appeals Commission (NAC) consisting of five members; allows the NAC to consider issues <i>de novo</i> in appeals; and amends authority to grant NAC the power to hear appeals of quasi-judicial determinations.</p>	<p>Concentrates land use authority in one non-elected commission. APCs replaced the Board of Zoning Appeals and have been in place now for 27 years. Local neighborhoods may argue that the new Commission will not represent their land use interests, which is the argument that led to succession movements in the 1990s and early 2000s.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This will have a Fiscal Impact as to reduced overtime expenditures for Planning staff to attend regularly occurring evening APC meetings/operational costs to execute APC meetings.</p>	
CRC 7	<p>Creates a 30-day time limit for the City Planning Commission (CPC) or Neighborhood Appeals Commission to concur with or dissent from Council upon remand and after Council asserts jurisdiction; Commission’s action on remand shall be referred to Council for a final vote; and upon re-referral from the Commission, the Council must act within 21 days or the action of the Commission becomes final.</p>	<p>Charter revision required. The Committee requested a CLA memo on whether time limit references can be changed from number of days to number of meetings as it relates to Charter Section 245(e).</p> <p>There are concerns herein as it relates to Council’s authority because 245(e) is unique inasmuch as it enables the Council to ‘step in the shoes’ of the underlying body–APC or CPC. It is unclear if any of the proposed time limitations or process changes will dilute Council’s land use authorities, particularly when Council cannot</p>	Note and File.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>act within 21 calendar days and the action of the CPC or proposed Neighborhood Appeals Commission on remand becomes final.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No Fiscal Impact.</p>	
CRC 8	<p>Deems a General Plan Amendment approved by City Council if Council does not act within 75 days of the Mayor’s approval of the GPA; and creates a new 75-day time limit in the Charter for Council to act on a GPA that has received approval from the City Planning Commission and Mayor, though the 75-day time limit is already codified in the Municipal Code.</p>	<p>No Charter Amendment required. Can be accomplished by amending the Municipal Code. The Committee did not take action. If adopted, this action may dilute the Council’s land use authority because it will deem approved a General Plan Amendment if the Council does not act within 75 days of the Mayor and City Planning Commission recommendation to approve. Currently the Council’s failure to act is deemed a disapproval of the GPA.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No Fiscal Impact.</p>	Note and File.
CRC 9	<p>Allows the Council to amend the Floor Area Restriction (FAR) limit to exceed 13:1 via ordinance.</p>	<p>Charter Amendment is required. The Committee requested a report from the City Attorney to clarify whether moving this provision from the Charter to the Municipal Code will trigger CEQA.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No Fiscal Impact.</p>	<p>Present to voters in November 2026. DETERMINE that the Floor Area Restriction Limitation Amendment is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines sections 15378(b)(5) (organizational or</p>

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
			administrative activities of governments) and 15061(b)(3) (common sense exemption).
CRC 10	Grants the Planning Department the authority to investigate, hear, and determine all applications for quasi-judicial review; grants the Planning Director the authority to appoint staff to perform the duties of quasi-judicial review; and deletes in their entirety existing Charter Sections related to variances, conditional use permits and other similar quasi-judicial approvals, projects requiring multiple approvals; and the City Planning Commission’s authority to delegate legislative authority to the Area Planning Commissions	<p>Charter Amendment is required. The Committee requested a CLA memo to clarify what aspects of the appeals process can be in the Charter versus the Municipal Code, and whether moving aspects of the Charter to the Municipal Code would conflict with State law. This proposal expands the decision makers on quasi-judicial actions beyond the Zoning Administrator and Deputy Advisory Agency, to also include the Planning Department.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No Fiscal Impact.</p>	Further study is required to assess the impacts of the new authorities granted to the Planning Department and deletions of Charter Sections 562-565.
CRC 11	Removes the Business Enterprises section of the Charter	<p>Charter amendment is required to remove this provision. Removal of this provision would assist with the establishment of a public bank and enable City departments and offices to sell the goods that they produce (e.g., asphalt, mulch).</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 12	Expand the City Council to 25 single-member districts, which shall be effective in 2032 upon the adoption of the final redistricting plan	<p>Charter amendment is required. The committee requested additional information as it relates to cost and administrative impacts.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This would have a fiscal impact.</p>	Further study is required. Consider for 2028 ballot.
CRC 13	Redesignates the City Administrative Officer as the Chief Financial Officer, with a ten-year term; defines roles in the development and adoption of Capital Improvement Program, preparation of a mid-term biennial budget report and a multi-year financial plan	<p>Approve with revisions.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026, with amendments as discussed in this report.
CRC 14	Bifurcates the office of the City Attorney into a City Attorney and a City Prosecutor	<p>Further study is required related to the costs associated with bifurcating the Office of the City Attorney and establishing an Office of the City Prosecutor; the impact bifurcation would have on various functions within the office; any Meet and Confer items with labor organizations; and how certain branches may be assigned between the offices.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This is anticipated to have a fiscal impact.</p>	Further study is required.
CRC 15	Incorporate Controller’s fraud, waste, and abuse duties into the Controller’s powers and duties	<p>No Charter amendment is required to enact this provision, which is already included in the Administrative Code.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 16	Includes clause that indicates that Council's authority to create departments, offices and boards does not limit the Mayor's power described in Section 514 (Transfer of Powers; New amendments)	<p>Charter amendment is required.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concerns with this proposal.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 17	Allows the Mayor to introduce Motions to propose an action of the Council during Council meetings; and allows Mayor to attend closed sessions, participate in discussions, but not vote	<p>Charter amendment is required.</p> <p>The Committee moved to note and file.</p> <p>The Mayor's Office may currently attend closed sessions at the discretion of the Council President and may seek sponsorship for Motions through Councilmembers.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 18	Increases Mayor's time limit for temporary transfer of employees to 365 days	<p>Charter amendment is required to implement this change. However, the Mayor is not prevented from renewing transfers, therefore the Mayor's power is not currently limited on this matter.</p> <p>The Committee discussed this item and noted that this may not be a necessary change.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 19	Allows the Mayor, by proclamation, to call a Special Meeting of the Council	<p>Charter amendment is required. The Committee moved to note and file.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 20	Increases the Mayor's authority to transfer funds without Council approval when funds are not in excess of \$271,460 or 4 percent of the budget of the account receiving the transfer, whichever is greater, but not to exceed \$400K; subjects the monetary limitations to annual adjustments based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI)	<p>Charter amendment is not required.</p> <p>The Charter currently allows the inter-departmental transfer limit to be established by ordinance (Sec. 342a). LAAC Section 5.35a was last adjusted in 2025 and includes a provision that allows for CPI adjustments.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 21	Allows the Mayor to transfer powers, duties and functions of departments, offices and boards to another department, office or board; Mayor may also direct any department, office or board to perform the powers, duties, and functions of another department; Transfers shall be effectuated by Executive Directive; No Council approval or consideration required	<p>Charter amendment is required. Such extended authority could subvert Council priorities with regard to City services, budgeting, staffing, programming etc.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concerns with this proposal and moved to note and file.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 22	Creates a Ranked Choice Voting system that replaces the current electoral runoff system; effective in 2032	<p>Charter amendment is required. The Committee requested additional information and further study.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This would have a fiscal impact if the City chooses to conduct its own elections and develop its own Ranked Choice Voting system.</p>	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 23	Lowers the voting age to 16 and allows these individuals to vote in elections for City offices and members of the Board of Education	Further study is required to determine feasibility and cost impacts. Fiscal Impact: This would have a fiscal impact.	Further study is required.
CRC 24	Changes ballot access requirements by extending filing deadlines/collection timeframes; lowers the signature threshold for nominating petitions to 350 registered voters (previously 500)	The Committee moved to note and file, with a request for additional reporting. Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.	Further study is required.
CRC 25	Extends the appointment window of commissioners from 45 days to 60 days when a vacancy occurs on a commission/board; prohibits appointing authority from requiring prospective appointees to sign a letter of resignation	Further study is required. The Committee moved to transfer these time limitations to the Los Angeles Administrative Code. Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.	Further study is required.
CRC 26	Create an Inspector General position for the Ethics Commission that has the power to audit and investigate City officials and departments	Charter amendment is required to enact this provision. The Committee moved to note and file. Concerns remain regarding conflict with current ethics enforcement and the Commission's Charter mandate, as well as conflict of interest issues. Fiscal Impact: This will have fiscal impact due to the creation of a new position and support positions. This impact is addressed in CRC 29.	Note and file.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 27	Prohibits a member of the Ethics Commission and the Executive Director from running for City office of LAUSD Board office for at least five years following the expiration of the term of office	No Committee discussion. Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.	Present to voters in November 2026.
CRC 28	Authorizes the Ethics Commission to retain its own general counsel, attorneys, and legal support staff that is independent from the City Attorney	No Committee discussion. The Committee requested further study regarding the implications. Fiscal Impact: May have fiscal impact.	Further study is required.
CRC 29	Increases the Ethics Commission's annual minimum appropriation to \$10 million	No Committee discussion. The Committee requested further study regarding the implications. Fiscal Impact: Will have fiscal impact relative to an increase in the annual minimum appropriation and support for CRC 26.	Note and file.
CRC 30	Allows the Council to suspend any elected officer by a three-fourths vote if charges have been filed and the officer is undergoing felony criminal proceedings, or criminal misdemeanor proceedings related to a violation of official duties; A member of the Council must introduce a Resolution with stated findings of misconduct and shall be heard and voted upon within seven calendar days of its introduction; No changes to compensation shall be made	The Charter currently allows the Council to suspend any elected officer if charges have been filed and the elected officer is undergoing felony criminal proceedings, or criminal misdemeanor proceedings related to a violation of their official duties. In instances where a suspension has occurred, Councilmembers have introduced Motions, which were then approved by a majority vote of the Council.	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	and the suspension will end if the officer is acquitted	<p>The Committee supported this recommendation and asked to remove the deadline for the Council to act on a suspension.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 31	If a Councilmember is suspended, the Council may appoint a person as a non-voting manager of the office of the suspended member; a Motion needs to be introduced and heard within seven calendar days regarding the appointment	<p>Charter Section 211 states that a temporary vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the Charter. However, the Charter currently does not address the filling of a temporary vacancy. Charter Section 409 outlines the procedure for filling permanent vacancies but does not discuss temporary vacancies. When temporary vacancies have occurred on the Council, the Council President has designated caretakers or appointed individuals to hold the office. In the event of a vacancy in the Mayor’s office, the Charter designates the Council President to act as the Mayor of the City. In the event of a vacancy in the City Attorney or Controller’s office, each respective office shall designate an assistant or deputy to act as an acting incumbent.</p> <p>The Committee supported this recommendation and asked to remove the deadline for the Council to act on a suspension. The Committee requested further study on the provisions concerning outside income.</p>	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 32	<p>Increases the monetary penalty for an Ethics violation to the greater of \$15,000 for each violation or three times the amount for which the person improperly reported or contributed; adjusts the maximum penalty according to CPI; prohibits the use of campaign funds to pay for violations</p>	<p>The Committee had questions regarding the restriction of campaign funds for ethics violations, and how it may have the potential to create politically motivated legal battles. The Committee requested further study regarding the implications.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Present to voters in November 2026.</p>
CRC 33	<p>Authorizes the Ethics Commission to submit ballot measures within their subject matter jurisdiction directly to the voters at the next scheduled City election; any ballot measure shall be presented to the Council which shall hold a public hearing and propose amendments, but shall not directly block Ethics Commission's authority to place measures on the ballot</p>	<p>The Committee recommended note and file.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact relative to costs associated with allowing the Ethics Commission to place items on the ballot that would not otherwise be submitted to the voters by the Council.</p>	<p>Note and file.</p>
CRC 34	<p>Aligns the City's contribution limits with LAUSD adjusted timelines</p>	<p>The Committee had concerns regarding financing limitations and how it may disadvantage candidates trying to compete with outside financial influences. No action was recommended.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Further study is required.</p>
CRC 35	<p>Removes language referencing matching public funds and adds language that</p>	<p>No Committee discussion.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Further study is required.</p>

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	discusses public campaign funding in order to more broadly permit additional public financing models		
CRC 36	Requires that a special election be called when a vacancy in City offices occur and the vacancy occurs more than one year before the expiration of the term of office; Special election must be held within 180 days of the vacancy	<p>Currently, Charter Section 409 states that the Council may fill a vacancy by appointing a person to hold the office for the portion of the unexpired term remaining until the next second Monday in December of an even-numbered year. If a portion of the term remains after that date, the Council shall call a special election to fill the remainder of the term, and consolidate it with the next primary nominating and general municipal election.</p> <p>This proposal would allow the Council to fill a vacancy by either calling for a special election or appointing an individual to hold the office if less than one year remains on the unexpired term. If more than one year remains on the unexpired term, the Council would be required to hold a special election.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concern with requiring the City to hold a special election for a vacancy if a regular primary election is forthcoming. The Committee asked staff to include provisions that would provide more flexibility for the timing of special elections relative to their</p>	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>proximity to regular primary elections.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This will have a fiscal impact due to the requirement to hold a special election within 180 days of a vacancy.</p>	
CRC 37	<p>Authorizes the Independent Redistricting Commission to hire separate legal counsel; Includes an annual minimum budget allocation of \$10M for the Independent Redistricting Commission</p>	<p>No Committee discussion. The Committee requested further study.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This will have fiscal impact due to the establishment of an annual minimum budget allocation.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 38	<p>Removes several provisions in Section 803 as its relates to LAUSD and adds these references to the Municipal Code</p>	<p>No Committee discussion.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.
CRC 39	<p>Includes language throughout the Charter that strengthens language access requirements to ensure that the City adopts and maintains policies that are accessible to the languages spoken by its residents</p>	<p>Provisions are included in Section 103 (Delivery of Services) stating that the City shall adopt and maintain policies that ensure language accessibility for City residents. This proposal also includes references to language as a diversity component in various sections of the Charter related to appointments to City boards and commissions. Further study is required to determine whether this proposal would obligate the City to provide translation for all the languages that are spoken in the City. Translation of City</p>	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>documents, programs, and services could have a cost impact and vary depending on the number of translated languages.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This would have a fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 40	Includes language that references Public Banking provisions, as outlined similarly in State Law	<p>CRC 11, which removes Charter Section 104(g) from the Charter would enable the creation of a public bank. As a result, public banking provisions are not required to be outlined in the Charter.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 41	Expands on Neighborhood Councils (NCs) authority by outlining their ability to conduct community outreach via stakeholder engagement, and collaboration with City departments, elected officials, and other NCs	<p>Currently, NCs may collaborate with City departments, elected officials, and other NCs, as well as conduct community outreach.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 42	Requires that NCs are allowed to provide public comment via telephone or online teleconferencing at all meetings of the Council and its Committees; Requires that NCs be placed in a separate queue for public comment if a Community Impact Statement has been submitted; extends these provisions to City Boards and Commissions	<p>SB 707 (Durazo; 2025) will be requiring public agencies to provide opportunities for public comment via teleconferencing. These provisions will be implemented on July 1, 2026, as required by SB 707. The City is currently developing systems to allow for public comment via teleconferencing. At the discretion of the Council and Committees, NCs are given the opportunity to provide public</p>	Note and file.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>comment on their Community Impact Statements.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 43	<p>Expands the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners (BONC) from seven to nine commissioners; the two additional commissioners shall be appointed by interested individuals who obtain the approval of a majority of all Neighborhood Councils; authorizes the Board to approve contracts and leases prepared on behalf of NCs or the NC system; requires that all board members complete legally-required training before voting at meetings</p>	<p>During Committee discussion, Committee members asked who proposed this recommendation. Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE) stated the recommendation was proposed and supported by BONC and NC advocates. The objective is to provide greater representation on the Board and reflect the diversity of the City. In subsequent discussions with DONE, it indicated that the other objective of the proposal is to solve quorum issues experienced by BONC. It is important to note that BONC’s current quorum requirement is 4 members; under a 9 member Board the quorum requirement would increase to 5 members. As such, it is unclear if the quorum problem would be solved by Board expansion. Also, the expansion of the Board would likely result in logistical challenges for the NCs as they would be tasked with undergoing a Citywide selection process involving 99 NCs.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE anticipates financial impacts however its extent is unknown and would require further study.</p>	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 44	Allows NCs to submit statements with respect to legislation proposed to or pending before a governmental agency	<p>Currently, City Departments and Offices, including boards and commissions, are prohibited from submitting positions and/or statements with respect to legislative pending before a governmental agency. The Council has Charter-designated authority over the establishment of the City’s position on legislation proposed to or pending before the state or federal government. In order to ensure a uniform position as a City on pending legislation, this Office advises against allowing NCs to submit statements with respect to legislation.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a fiscal impact.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 45	Allows NCs via the Chair of the Board of Neighborhood Councils, or another designated Commissioner, to submit to the Mayor their budget requests for the next fiscal year	<p>DONE reports this proposal would create additional administrative responsibilities for the Department and BONC. BONC would be required to coordinate and potentially consolidate numerous NC budget submissions thereby affecting its and the Department’s workload. DONE reports that BONC requests removal of this proposed recommendation from consideration inasmuch as it lacks support from the Neighborhood Council system</p> <p>This matter was briefly discussed in Committee; Members indicated that NCs are currently</p>	Note and file.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>able to submit budget requests if they wish to. As such, it is unclear what need this proposal addresses.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE anticipates financial impacts however its extent is unknown and would require further study.</p>	
CRC 46	Allows NCs to submit (via a majority vote) to Mayor questions that could be asked during the interview process for the General Manager of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment	<p>DONE states that BONC and the advocates have expressed support for this recommendation. However, the candidate selection process is subject to personnel hiring requirements and protocols that require confidentiality. As such, the Personnel Department should be consulted as to the legality/practicality of this recommendation.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: The financial impact is unknown and would require further review.</p>	Note and file.
CRC 47	Updates the title of Section 905 to "Initial Implementation of the Plan"	<p>The Committee considered this a “clerical” adjustment and inquired if there is a way to make these adjustments outside of the Charter. However, it is unclear if these adjustments can be made outside the Charter and may result in technical inconsistencies between the Charter and the Administrative Code.</p> <p>As proposed by the CRC to update Section 905, a Charter amendment would be required.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to official department materials.</p>	
CRC 48	Changes the title of Section 907 "Early Warning System" to "Advance Notice and Opportunities for Input"	<p>The Committee considered this a “clerical” adjustment and inquired if there is a way to make these adjustments outside of the Charter. However, it is unclear if these adjustments can be made outside the Charter and may result in technical inconsistencies between the Charter and the Administrative Code.</p> <p>As proposed by CRC to update Section 907, a Charter amendment would be required.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to department materials.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.
CRC 49	Capitalizes "Neighborhood Council" throughout the Charter	<p>The Committee considered this a “clerical” adjustment and inquired if there is a way to make these adjustments outside of the Charter. However, it is unclear if these adjustments can be made outside the Charter and may result in technical inconsistencies between the Charter and the Administrative Code.</p> <p>As proposed by CRC to update Section 909, 910, 911, 912, 913 and 914, a Charter amendment would be required.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to department materials.</p>	
CRC 50	Replaces the word "Citizen" with "Civic" participation throughout Article IX (Neighborhood Councils	<p>The Committee considered this a “clerical” adjustment and inquired if there is a way to make these adjustments outside of the Charter. However, it is unclear if these adjustments can be made outside the Charter and may result in technical inconsistencies between the Charter and the Administrative Code.</p> <p>Department of Neighborhood Empowerment states that this change clarifies broad community engagement and inclusivity instead of implying that participation is strictly limited to U.S. citizens.</p> <p>As proposed by CRC to update Section 900, a Charter amendment would be required.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to department materials.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.
CRC 51	Replaces the word "officers" with Board Members in Department of Neighborhood Empowerment Charter provisions and capitalizes reference to “Neighborhood Councils”	<p>The Committee considered this a “clerical” adjustment and inquired if there is a way to make these adjustments outside of the Charter. However, it is unclear if these adjustments can be made outside the Charter and may</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>result in technical inconsistencies between the Charter and the Administrative Code.</p> <p>As proposed by CRC to update Section 901, a Charter amendment would be required.</p> <p>Please note the word “officers” also appears under Section 906 (a) (1). To be consistent with CRC the reference to “officers” in Section 906 should also be adjusted.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to department materials.</p>	
CRC 52	Updates the title of Section 904 to "Development and Maintenance of the Neighborhood Council Plan and capitalizes reference to “Neighborhood Councils”	<p>The Committee considered this a “clerical” adjustment and inquired if there is a way to make these adjustments outside of the Charter. However, it is unclear if these adjustments can be made outside the Charter and may result in technical inconsistencies between the Charter and the Administrative Code.</p> <p>As proposed by CRC to update Section 904, a Charter amendment would be required.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to department materials.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 53	<p>Updates certification and bylaws requirements for NCs by removing provision stating that NC membership is open to "everyone who lives; works or owns property in the area"; indicates that "stakeholders" will be further defined by ordinance and capitalizes reference to "Neighborhood Councils"</p>	<p>DONE indicates that the Council expanded the definition of "stakeholder" in the Administrative Code to include community interest stakeholders such as students, volunteers and members of local congregations. As such, DONE states that this recommendation aligns with the Council's intent.</p> <p>As proposed by CRC to update Section 906, a Charter amendment would be required.</p> <p>Please note "officers" reference under CRC 51.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: DONE reports minimal fiscal impact associated with updating changes to department materials.</p>	<p>Present to voters in November 2026.</p>
CRC 54	<p>Includes a provision that states that the authority of the Board of Police Commissioners to issue instructions to the Chief of Police shall not supersede the authority of the Council to adopt ordinances governing the policies of the Chief and the Police Department; Notes that any ordinances adopted by the Council shall supersede the Board of Police Commissioners' authority</p>	<p>The Committee indicated it would like this item to be presented to full council for consideration, and instructed the CLA to report on whether Council's ordinance authority should be limited to specific categories. The Committee also asked for a brief summary of how the Board of Police Commissioners system was created and how its authority has been changed over the years. The Committee indicated that if this matter is adopted by Council, the reference to "applicable ordinances" recommended for</p>	<p>Further study is required.</p>

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>inclusion in Charter Section 574 under CRC 58 should also be adopted.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This will have no fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 55	<p>Requires the Police Department to purchase liability insurance for each police officer; Coverage cannot be less than \$1M and cost of insurance should not exceed \$50 per month; Cost of insurance shall be adjusted by CPI; Indicates that if an officer is found liable, any payments to the opposing party shall be paid out using the insurance payout first before paying from the General Fund</p>	<p>The Committee instructed the LAPD, CAO, CLA and City Attorney to report to the Budget and Finance Committee with an analysis of the proposal. This would require the CAO to Meet and Confer with labor.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This will have a fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Further study is required. Instruct the LAPD, CAO, CLA and City Attorney to report as outlined in the report below.</p>
CRC 56	<p>Includes a new section in Charter Section 245 that allows the Council veto actions of the Board of Police Commissioners; Vetos will be sent back to the Board of Police Commissioners for their consideration, and may concur with the Council, override the Council's veto, or modify the Board's original action; If the Board overrides the Council's action, the action shall be transmitted to the Council and the Council shall have the same authority to act on a matter as that originally held by the Board</p>	<p>The Committee indicated it supported this recommendation, and instructed the CLA, in coordination with the CAO, to report on the Council's existing authority under Section 245 and any further ways to enhance it.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This will have no fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Further study is required.</p>

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
CRC 57	Includes a provision in Section 1070 (Rights and Due Process Procedures) that allows the Council to consider a personnel determination made by the Police Board of Rights and have the ability to veto and remand the matter back to the Board of Rights for reconsideration; the Board of Rights shall have 30 days to reconsider the action and determine whether to override the Council; if the Council action is overridden, the Council shall consider the override and shall have the same authority to act on the matter as that originally held by the Board of Rights	The Committee noted and filed this item without discussion. Currently, there is no veto process for Board of Rights (BOR) decisions. Once a BOR has made a decision in a personnel matter, the Chief may uphold the decision of the BOR, or impose a lesser penalty. Charter Section 1070(f) allows an officer removed from the Department as a result of a BOR to file a request with the Chief of Police to have the matter reheard or to be heard on the cause of the member’s removal, together with a supporting affidavit setting forth in clear and concise language the reasons or grounds for a hearing or rehearing. If the Chief determines there is good cause for a rehearing, the matter will be referred to a new BOR.	Note and File.
CRC 58	Includes language that requires the Chief of Police to ensure that the Police Departments supports and protects the constitutional rights of all persons, specifically their rights to assemble and protest; includes a provision that states that the Chief of Police can directly remove officers if they have engaged in misconduct	The Committee requested that this recommendation be presented to Council for consideration, and instructed the CLA to report on the need to Meet and Confer with labor on this matter. Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact associated with the addition of language to the Administrative Code on constitutional protections. There may be a Fiscal Impact associated with the Chief’s ability to fire officers, depending on what appeals process the City	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		would implement for terminated officers.	
CRC 59	Authorizes the creation of a two-year operating budget consisting of two consecutive fiscal years that includes the following associated provisions: creation of a Four-Year Strategic Plan that identifies the City's goals and priorities; shifts the departmental timeline for budget estimates to December 1 instead of January 1; shifts the timeline for the Mayor's submittal of a proposed biennial budget to April 1st instead of April 20th; requires public comment for the proposed biennial budget to occur over at least three separate dates during the Budget Committee's consideration (first day of hearings, final day of hearings, and another of the Committee's choosing) and at least once during the Council's consideration	<p>The Chair recommended approval of this matter with an instruction to the CLA to prepare general and enabling language that would preserve Council's flexibility as it relates to budget cycles, and allow implementation details to be outlined in the Los Angeles Administrative Code.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This is not anticipated to have a fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Present to voters in November 2026.</p> <p>1) Request the City Attorney to prepare ballot language to indicate that the City shall operate on a biennial budget cycle encompassing a period of two consecutive fiscal years, unless otherwise stated by ordinance or resolution that is adopted by the Council or Mayor.</p> <p>2) Instruct the CAO and City Attorney to report if there are other Charter amendments that are necessary to effectuate the two-year budget.</p>
CRC 60	Requires departmental performance evaluations with potential proposed adjustments to Departments for the second year of the biennial cycle; requires the CAO to develop a Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report that provides updated expenditures	<p>Reporting requirement provisions could be incorporated into the City's Financial Policies or incorporated into the Administrative Code.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This is not anticipated to have a fiscal impact.</p>	1) Note and file CRC 60 inasmuch as the Mid-Term Biennial Budget evaluation process and report can be established by ordinance.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	and revenue projections; Requires Council and Mayoral approval of report		2) Instruct the CAO, CLA, and City Attorney to report on proposed amendments to either the City’s Financial Policies or Administrative Code to incorporate the core components required for the two-year budget (i.e., Four Year Strategic Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, the Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report and related evaluation process, etc.).
CRC 61	Replaces language for the letting of contracts from "lowest responsive and responsible bidder" with "best value" language for competitive bidding and competitive sealed proposals	Charter amendment required. Charter Section 371(a) requires that contracts shall be let to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. This proposal would change the requirement from “lowest bidder” to “best value”. The proprietary departments have identified a number of challenges associated with the existing language, and have suggested a “best value” requirement to improve procurement. The existing language and the proposed language each have a unique set of risks and benefits. If Council wishes to proceed with presenting this matter to voters, the language should include the	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>ability to define best value through ordinance.</p> <p>The proprietary departments are seeking these adjustments for their contracting activities only. This may result in two different contracting approaches in the City - one for proprietary departments (which is less restrictive) and one for common departments (with existing restrictions). Additional analysis should be conducted before presenting this matter to voters.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund, inasmuch as this would apply to proprietary departments only. The proprietary departments report that this change will have a positive fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 62	Removes the ordinance requirement for the letting of contracts pursuant to competitive sealed proposals	This change could be effectuated through ordinance. Currently, departments (including proprietary departments) require Council-approved ordinances for each project they wish to let using the Competitive Sealed Proposal method pursuant to Charter Section 373(b). Council could approve an ordinance granting blanket authority for proprietary departments to let contracts using this method. As is currently the case, the ensuing contracts let using this method would continue to be subject to Council review.	This is a policy matter for the City Council to consider. If desired, amend LAAC.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund, inasmuch as this would apply to proprietary departments only. The proprietary departments report that this change will have a positive fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 63	Allows exceptions to lowest bid requirements for critical infrastructure and software	<p>Charter amendment is required. Charter Section 371(e)(7) currently excludes contracts for equipment repairs or parts obtained from the manufacturer of the equipment or its exclusive agent from competitive bidding requirements. The amendment would extend this exclusion to software.</p> <p>CRC 61-65 were discussed as reforms to the proprietary departments, but the language provided in the CRC report would apply to all City departments.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund if this amendment is applied to proprietary departments only. The proprietary departments report that this change will have a positive fiscal impact.</p>	Present to voters in November 2026.
CRC 64	Allows contracting authority to cure technical/administrative defects as it relates to violations of campaign	Charter measure required. The proprietaries report that this change is needed to avoid bidder disqualification over minor technical defects. The amendment would allow	Present to voters in November 2026.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	<p>contribution related disclosures;</p>	<p>departments to cure these defects without restarting the procurement process.</p> <p>CRC 61-65 were discussed as reforms to the proprietary departments, but the language provided in the CRC report would apply to all City departments. The language provided in the CRC report would allow the provisions of this amendment to be further specified by ordinance. Such an ordinance could require the relevant department to provide documentation to indicate that any defects cured under this section are truly administrative or technical in nature.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund if this amendment is applied to proprietary departments only. The proprietary departments report that this change will have a positive fiscal impact.</p>	
<p>CRC 65</p>	<p>Allows the Department of Airports, Harbor Department, and Department of Water and Power are authorized to enter into 66 year leases, subject to the approval of the Council</p>	<p>Charter amendment is required. Implementing this recommendation would provide lease length parity across the proprietary departments. Language should be added to state that Council-approved 66 year leases are allowable unless otherwise precluded by state or federal law.</p>	<p>Present to voters in November 2026.</p>

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund, inasmuch as this would apply to proprietary departments only. The proprietary departments report that this change will have a positive fiscal impact.</p>	
CRC 66	<p>Requires periodic review of the City Charter every ten years through the creation of a Charter Reform Commission consisting of 13 members, and gives the Commission the authority to submit Charter amendments directly to the voters without Mayor and/or Council approval</p>	<p>The Chair recommended approving this recommendation in concept and moved to provide implementation details in the Los Angeles Administrative Code. Please note that Los Angeles Administrative Code Sections 8.330 to 8.335 currently outline the frequency and manner by which a Charter Reform Commission shall be established.</p>	Amend the Administrative Code.
<i>Council Motions</i>			
25-0118	<p>Motion (McOsker - Soto-Martinez) and CLA report: require the Port of Los Angeles to maintain a Public Access Investment Plan; integrate a Workforce Impact Report requirement into Port-related decisionmaking</p>	<p>No Charter measure is required. The Port of Los Angeles (POLA) already maintains a Public Access Investment Plan as part of its regular capital budgeting. Additionally, Council has adopted a Motion (C.F. 26-0426-S1) seeking non-Charter pathways for implementing a Workforce Impact Reporting requirement for tenants at the Port. The report(s) related to those requests/instructions are forthcoming.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund, inasmuch as this would apply to POLA only.</p>	Note and File.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		POLA may have a fiscal impact, but its extent is unknown.	
26-0426-S2	Motion (McOsker - Padilla): Integration of a Workforce Impact Report framework into Port-related decisionmaking	<p>No Charter measure is required. Additionally, Council previously adopted a Motion (CF: 26-0426-S1) on a similar topic seeking non-Charter pathways for implementing a Workforce Impact Reporting requirement for tenants at the Port. The reports related to those requests/instructions are forthcoming.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund, inasmuch as this would apply to POLA only. POLA may have a fiscal impact, but its extent is unknown.</p>	Note and File.
26-0489-S1	Report: Los Angeles City Employees' Retirement System (LACERS) Proposed Charter Reforms	<p>In the LACERS' report, dated April 16, 2026, the LACERS recommends the following Charter Reform proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant LACERS the exclusive authority to meet staffing needs and set appropriate compensation levels, as determined by the Board; 2. Allow LACERS to set the frequency and timing of its Board Meetings; 3. Grant the LACERS Board independent authority to select its chief executive (e.g., General Manager) and determine the General 	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>Manager’s compensation; and,</p> <p>4. Grant LACERS the ability to select its own legal counsel if the LACERS Board determines that the City Attorney has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>An actuarial study, as well as meet and confer, may be required for further consideration of these proposals.</p>	
26-0489-S2	Motion (Jurado - Hutt, et al.): Phased increase of the annual appropriation to RAP from 0.0325 of assessed value of all property to 0.0650.	See CRC 4 above.	See CRC 4 above.
26-0489-S3	Motion (Soto-Martinez - Harris-Dawson): Require a regular schedule of fee studies.	No Charter measure is required. Administrative Code and City Financial Policies can address the intent of this Motion.	Further study is required. CAO, CLA, and City Attorney to report.
26-0489-S4	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Expand the Neighborhood Appeals Commission (NAC) from five to seven members and require each seat of the NAC to be represented by appointees from each of the current Area Planning Commissions.	<p>Charter amendment is required. No action was taken by the Committee inasmuch as the Motion was continued to a date to be determined.</p> <p>Consistent with this Office’s recommendation to note and file CRC 6, which proposes to replace the existing APCs with the new NAC, the recommendation for this Motion is to note and file, inasmuch as the Motion is contingent on the passage of CRC 6.</p>	Note and File.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
26-0489-S5	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Evaluation of the Ethics Inspector General and its relationship with other City Inspector Generals	Consistent with this Office’s recommendation to further study CRC 26, the recommendation is to approve this Motion, inasmuch as the Motion requests further reporting on this issue.	Approve Motion to report.
26-0489-S6	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Evaluation of voting reforms, including Ranked Choice Voting, Approval Voting	Consistent with this Office’s recommendation to further study CRC 22, the recommendation is to approve this Motion, inasmuch as the Motion requests further reporting on this issue.	Approve Motion to report.
26-0489-S7	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Evaluation on impacts and costs associated with bifurcating the City Attorney’s office and establishment of an Office of Legal Counsel	Consistent with this Office’s recommendation to further study CRC 14, the recommendation is to approve this Motion, inasmuch as the Motion requests further reporting on this issue.	Approve.
26-0489-S8	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Clarification of suspension for misconduct of all elected officials.	Consistent with this Office’s recommendation to further study CRC 30, the recommendation is to approve this Motion, inasmuch as the Motion requests further reporting on this issue.	Approve Motion to report.
26-0489-S9	Motion (Raman - Blumenfield): Establish the Neighborhood Appeals Commission (NAC) as the sole appeal body within the City (presumably on planning and land use matters) and increase the NAC’s membership from five to seven to represent seven regions of the City.	Charter amendment is required. No action was taken by the Committee inasmuch as the Motion was continued to a date to be determined. Granting the NAC the authority to have first and final consideration of all planning and land use appeals raises serious concerns about the dilution of Council’s authority to review planning and land use	Note and File.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>matters, including Council’s authority to assert jurisdiction pursuant to Charter Section 245(e), and impacts to existing appellate bodies (e.g. City Planning Commission, Board of Building and Safety Commissioners).</p> <p>Consistent with this Office’s recommendation to note and file CRC 6, which proposes to replace the existing APCs with the new NAC, the recommendation for this Motion is to note and file, inasmuch as the Motion is contingent on the passage of CRC 6.</p>	
26-0637	Motion (McOsker - Park): Allowing Port Wardens to elect to participate in LACERS rather than LAFPP.	<p>The Committee instructed the CAO, in coordination with POLA and LACERS, to report to Budget Committee on 1) the estimated fiscal impacts to both LAFPP and LACERS, including short-term and long-term liabilities and contribution requirements, and 2) identification of any collective bargaining implications or meet and confer requirements associated with the proposed change. Further, an actuarial study would be required for further consideration.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: This may have a Fiscal Impact.</p>	Further study is required.
26-0638	Motion (Soto-Martinez - Jurado): Noncitizen voting in	Currently, Charter Section 408 states that in order for a person to	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	elections for City offices and members of the LAUSD Board of Education.	<p>be eligible to vote, a person must be registered in the manner and have the qualifications required by the general laws of the state respecting the registration and qualification of votes for state and county elections. Pursuant to California Constitution Article II Section 2, a United States citizen 18 years of age and resident in this State may vote.</p> <p>Further study is required to determine whether it would be feasible for the City to allow for noncitizen voting if the City conducts its own elections, as well as any associated costs and necessary Charter changes. This study could also determine whether permissive language could be included in the Charter that would allow for noncitizen voting should state law change.</p>	
26-0647	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Require appointees to Boards and Commissions to submit Ethics-related disclosure forms prior to a Council vote.	Currently, Charter Section 502(e) states that the Council shall not approve an appointee before the appointee’s financial disclosure statements have been filed with the Ethics Commission and submitted to the Council. This Charter Section applies to City boards and commissions that are required to file a Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700), and not boards or commissions that are strictly advisory in nature. This Motion would seek to apply this financial disclosure statement requirement to <u>all</u>	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>appointees to City boards and commissions, including those that are advisory in nature.</p> <p>Further study would be required to determine whether advisory appointees to City boards and commissions are subject to City and State ethics laws.</p>	
26-0654	<p>Motion (Raman - Blumenfield): Assign responsibility to the Department of Public Works to construct, operate, and maintain facilities that are not in the public right-of-way, but under which the City has an agreement to do so.</p>	<p>No Charter measure is required. Currently a draft ordinance to assign responsibility to the Department of Public Works to maintain bicycle and multi-use paths not in the public right-of-way, which the City has an obligation to maintain has been approved by the Transportation Committee and is pending before the Public Works Committee (C.F. 25-0481).</p>	Note and File.
26-0656	<p>Motion (McOsker - Blumenfield): Remove full-time employment requirement for Board of Public Works members.</p>	<p>Charter revision is required. Committee’s discussions regarding governance and structure of the Department of Public Works under CRC 1 are ongoing. Discussion of Board of Public Works full-time status should be considered as a part of that discussion. If CRC 1 is noted and filed this Motion could be considered a standalone proposal.</p>	Further study is required.
26-0658	<p>Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Prohibition on an appointed caretaker or appointee from seeking</p>	<p>This Motion would prohibit a designated caretaker and appointee to a vacant Council office from seeking election to their appointed Council District</p>	Further study is required. This Motion should be evaluated concurrently with CRC 31 and CRC 36.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
	election to the appointed Council District for five years.	for a period of five years. This Motion should be further studied in the context of CRC 31 and CRC 36, as these proposals address issues surrounding the appointment of non-voting temporary managers and the filling of vacancies.	
26-0659	Motion (Padilla, Park - McOsker): Increase the local residency requirements on the Board of Airport Commissioners to three members within the area surrounding Los Angeles International Airport and two members within the area surrounding Van Nuys Airport.	<p>Charter revision is required. The Committee requested additional information on whether this can be effectuated through ordinance. If the Council wishes to proceed with increasing local residency requirements on the Board of Airport Commissioners, it should also consider increasing the total membership of the Board.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: No impact to the General Fund, inasmuch as this would apply to LAWA only. The fiscal impact on LAWA is unknown.</p>	This is a policy matter for the City Council to consider.
<i>Departmental Recommendations</i>			
Personnel #1	Change number of exempt positions in the City	The Committee asked the Personnel Department to continue undergoing the meet-and-confer process with labor and to update the Council on any progress. At this time, the Personnel Department is continuing discussions with labor concerning those proposals in a meet-and-confer process. Further the Executive Employees Relations Committee (EERC) is	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		expected to consider these proposals as well.	
Personnel #2	Revise examination rules	The Committee asked the Personnel Department to continue undergoing the meet-and-confer process with labor and to update the Council on any progress. At this time, the Department is continuing discussions with labor concerning those proposals in a meet-and-confer process. Further the EERC is expected to consider these proposals as well.	Further study is required.
Personnel #3	Increase military credits and create option to combine open and promotional lists	The Committee asked the Personnel Department to continue undergoing the meet-and-confer process with labor and to update the Council on any progress. At this time, the Department is continuing discussions with labor concerning those proposals in a meet-and-confer process. Further the EERC is expected to consider these proposals as well.	Further study is required.
Personnel #4	Transfer administrative authority from the Civil Service Commission to the General Manager of Personnel	The Committee asked the Personnel Department to continue undergoing the meet-and-confer process with labor and to update the Council on any progress. At this time, the Department is continuing discussions with labor concerning those proposals in a meet-and-confer process. Further the EERC is expected to consider these proposals as well.	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
<i>Committee Deliberations</i>			
Rules #1	Replicate any changes made to the Police Department in the Charter sections to the Fire Department as well, as they largely mirror each other in the Charter.	The Committee instructed this Office to recommend changes to the Charter for the Fire Department to mirror those being proposed for the Police Department. A preliminary review would suggest that CRC 54 (Department subject to ordinance), CRC 56 (Council Veto over Board) and CRC 58 (Chief has authority to terminate) would be applicable to the Fire Department, but additional analysis is required.	Further study is required.
Rules #2	Strengthen independence of the Police Department Inspector General.	The Committee recommended that Section 573 of the Charter related to the Office of the Inspector General of Police Department and the Independent Assessor of the Fire Department be amended to strike any authority of the Board of Police Commissioners and Board of Fire Commissioners, by a majority vote, to direct the Inspector General or Independent Assessor not to commence or continue an investigation or audit.	Present to voters in November 2026.
Rules #3	Amend Section 104(d) regarding the LA River Bed	Charter Section 104(d) currently states that the bed of the LA River "...shall not ever be sold, granted, leased, transferred or alienated in any way, but shall be kept at all times for municipal purposes, free and clear of all	Further study is required.

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Summary of Review	Recommended Disposition
		<p>encumbrances and obstructions...”</p> <p>The Committee requested that this Charter section be moved to the Administrative Code. At this time, this proposal has not been analyzed and the impacts are unknown.</p>	
Rules #4	Revise Section 242(a) to move the Council conduct of meetings section to the Administrative Code.	Request a report to revise provisions related to the meeting requirements for Council.	This is a policy matter for the Council to consider.
Rules #5	Amend Section 461(a) as it relates to signature requirements to change the signature requirement for referendary petitions from 10 percent to 15 percent	The Committee requested an amendment to Section 461(a) to change the signature requirement referendary petitions to 15 percent of all registered voters. This change is intended to create parity with Section 451(b), which currently includes a 15 percent signature requirement for initiative petitions.	Present to voters in November 2026.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The Rules Committee considered a wide range of recommendations to revise the Charter. Recommendations were primarily submitted by the Charter Reform Commission (CRC or “Commission”) in their report of April 2, 2026. In addition, the Rules Committee requested that Councilmembers submit additional suggestions for Charter amendments to the record via Motion and that City Departments submit recommendations to the Committee via correspondence to the Council File. Finally, members of the Rules Committee requested consideration of additional Charter amendments during their deliberations of all proposed amendments.

The Commission submitted proposals to be presented to voters in November 2026. However, there are subsequent elections available for voter consideration. Charter changes could be considered in 2028, with the March primary and November General elections in a presidential year. The Council may place items on a ballot at any time and can act to do so well before any deadlines associated with placing measures on the 2028 ballots. As a result, this represents an

opportunity for Council to move forward with those items recommended for further study and consideration well in advance of any deadline to place a measure on a ballot in 2028.

Further analysis is required for several issues presented by the Commission. The CLA has prepared a brief review of many of the items considered by the Rules Committee, but in-depth analysis is required to fully inform the Council and there is insufficient time to conduct the needed analysis at the required level. It may also be necessary to develop alternative Charter language to refine or revise the original proposals, but time is not available to prepare such language. In addition, complete fiscal impact statements need to be prepared as none were submitted by the Commission for any of these proposals. This is all noted in the report where relevant.

Several of these measures have impacts related to labor relations and may require Meet and Confer, actuarial studies, and State-required public notice periods prior to any action by Council to place those measures on the ballot. Time is necessary to further determine whether certain measures require these considerations. This is also noted in the report where relevant.

Finally, as was discussed by the members of the Rules Committee, some Charter issues under consideration have related measures in other sections of the Charter. It is essential that proposed changes be integrated across all affected elements of the Charter, otherwise significant conflicts could be created. All such cross-referenced matters should be identified and reviewed; limited time to evaluate the proposed Charter revisions has prevented a full review of all such cross-references and analysis of cumulative impacts.

SPECIFIC CHARTER REVISIONS

The following provides information concerning many of the Charter revisions discussed by the Rules Committee, as summarized in Table 1. Committee members had asked for additional information on several items, either as questions or as full memoranda or reports. Best efforts, with support from other City Departments, were made to address the questions raised.

In some cases, time is not available to fully analyze the issue. The complexity of the data required, the operational issues on Departments, the potential that multiple sections of the Charter are connected to a single change, the impact on balance of authorities among elected officials and operating Departments, or long-term consequences of the proposed changes require a more thoughtful review that is not possible before the deadline to place such measures on the November 3, 2026 ballot. These issues are noted with a recommendation for further reporting.

Note that all proposals in Table 1 are not discussed in the following text. Only those issues that involve additional analysis or responses to Committee questions are included.

CRC 1 – Public Works

Amends Charter Sections 507, 514, 581, 582,

The Commission report provides several revisions to the Charter that would realign responsibilities within the Department of Public Works. The Commission staff reports, however, do not fully explain the range of issues that the reforms seek to address. There is no clear

statement of the problems that need to be resolved and how the proposed changes address them. Further, voters have approved several changes to Public Works since 1999, but there is no analysis of the effects of these previous changes on Public Works Operations and why further changes are needed. Nor is it clear how the division of power will be enacted between the Board and Director of Public Works as recommended by the Commission. While the Commission's stated intent is to empower the Director of Public Works, language is included that the Director's powers and duties will be subject to the instruction of the Board.

From the outset, it should be noted that the Department of Public Works is charged with a very broad mandate, both in the Charter and in the Administrative Code. They are responsible for the delivery of new infrastructure and facilities, the operations and maintenance of City infrastructure, delivery of daily services, and management of specialized programs such as implementation of the City's minimum wage laws.

In the context of such a substantial mandate, it is unclear, for example, how empowering a Director of Public Works to direct all 5,000 employees of the current Board of Public Works and five Bureaus would be more effective than each Bureau operating as they do under a focused area of service with a Chief Executive managing that work. Further, consolidation of other Departments into Public Works would only serve to increase the demands on a single administrator. Finally, other Departments that significantly impact the work of the Bureaus are not, and would not be, under the Director of Public Works, such as the Department of Water and Power, the Building and Safety Department, and the Planning Department, so it is unclear how proposed changes would address these inter-departmental relationships.

Further, it is unclear at what point coordination is problematic between the Bureaus. Projects are identified, designed, and implemented in many stages. It is unclear whether the proposed solutions are aimed at all of these stages and how the proposed solutions align across all of these stages. A project such as the Los Angeles Convention Center required analysis of whether a project should be implemented, identification of program elements, analysis of procurement options and project costs, implementation of procurement, design, and construction among the many phases of project development and implementation. It is unclear how the proposed changes to Public Works would address all elements of a project's development and implementation.

There are many models to enhance cooperation, coordination, and collaboration among independent agencies. It is not clear that the Commission has investigated whether any of these models could be implemented effectively without Charter amendments. The Emergency Operations Board coordinates across City departments in times of a natural disaster, for example. Similarly, Mayor Garcetti had created the Unified Homeless Response Center as a means to ensure departmental and inter-agency collaboration across the Homelessness Response System, both within the City and with outside entities. It is possible such models could more effectively address concerns related to inter- and intra-departmental coordination for Public Works.

The Committee supported amending the Charter to remove language specifying the roles and responsibilities of both the Board and Director of Public Works and remove all references to specific Bureaus in order for the City to determine the specific structure of the Department by ordinance at a future date.

Given the size and complexity of the Department and the issues already raised regarding the Commission's recommendations to alter the governance and structure of the Department, this Office recommends that the Council continue to study and assess potential reforms to the structure of the Department of Public Works, including collaborative models that can be implemented without voter approval, prior to revising sections of the Charter that dictate the governance of the Department.

During deliberations, the Committee requested that Section 507 of the Charter be amended to remove references to the specific Public Works Bureaus. This section describes the title of the Chief Executive Officer of all Departments. The only City Departments identified in this section are the Bureaus within Public Works. This might suggest that all of these Bureaus are required to exist, though that is not the intent of the Section. Removing references to these Bureaus would clarify this point and provide an opportunity for future reorganization.

Recommendation

1. Further study is required regarding how this proposal may impact Department of Public Works operations and to address coordination issues between Bureaus within the Department and among City Departments.
2. Present to voters in November 2026 a Charter amendment to revise Section 507 to remove reference to the existing Bureaus of the Department of Public Works.

CRC 2 – Mandating a Capital Improvement Plan

Adds Charter Section 323

The Charter Reform Commission is recommending that a new section be added to the Charter requiring that a Capital Improvement Program be established by ordinance. As proposed by the Commission, the Department of Public Works would be designated as the lead agency for the preparation of five-year capital plans.

The Committee supported codifying a Capital Improvement Plan within the Charter. The Committee did not discuss which City agency should be charged with management and administration of the Capital Improvement Plan nor specifics of how a revised capital planning process would be implemented.

Currently, the Administrative Code requires an annual Capital Improvement Expenditure Program to be submitted by the Mayor as a part of the Proposed Budget submission (LAAC Section 5.43). The City's capital planning work is conducted through the budgeting process as the Capital and Technology Improvement Expenditure Program (CTIEP), which is managed by the City Administrative Officer (CAO). The CAO also releases a five-year CTIEP reference document that reports on capital projects that have been completed, are under construction, or in-design, and on the status of projects included in the CTIEP.

The CRC's proposal would shift discretion over a capital plan from the Mayor and Council to the Department of Public Works and transfer oversight from the CAO to the Department of Public

Works. While the Department of Public Works delivers a significant volume of capital projects currently in the CTIEP, the Department of Recreation and Parks, Library Department, Department of Transportation, General Services Department, and Information Technology Agency are also involved with managing and delivering capital projects.

Should the Council wish to require establishment of a Capital Improvement Program within the Charter, this Office would recommend that the Charter language simply mandate establishment of a Capital Improvement Program with specific governance, administration, and implementation of the program to be defined by ordinance.

Recommendation

Present to voters in November 2026. Request the City Attorney to prepare ballot language to establish a Capital Improvement Program within the Charter with the parameters, governance, and administration of the program and capital planning process to be established by ordinance.

CRC 3 – Minimum Two Percent Allocation of the City's Budget to the Department of Public Works

Adds Charter Section 583

This proposed Charter amendment would require that two percent of the City's annual budget be allocated to the Department of Public Works. The proposed Charter language would also establish a Public Works Fund and require the two percent allocation, and other allocations/revenues generated by the Department of Public Works, be deposited into this Fund.

Historically, the Department of Public Works is regularly allocated greater than two percent of the City's budget. Over the previous five fiscal years, the Department of Public Works has, on average, received 6.48 percent of unrestricted revenues. The Department of Public Works also receives significant special fund appropriations, including revenue generated by solid waste fees, sewer fees, street lighting maintenance assessments, and street damage restoration fees and revenue from Measure M, Measure W, and SB1.

This recommendation could be enacted by ordinance or established as one of the City's financial policies should the Council wish to enact this policy.

Both the CAO and the CLA advise against placing funding obligations in the Charter. The Mayor and Council may make such funding decisions in the budget process. The City often encounters financial challenges that require flexibility in allocating resources. Placing funding commitments in the Charter reduces the ability of the Mayor and Council to be flexible in addressing those financial challenges.

No action was recommended by the Committee.

Recommendation

Our Office recommends the Committee note and file this item.

CRC 4 – Double Park Funding to 0.065 percent

Amends Charter Section 593

This proposed Charter amendment would double the Charter-mandated annual appropriation to the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) from 0.0325 percent to 0.0650 percent of assessed value of all property as assessed for City taxes. However, the CLA advises against placing funding obligations in the Charter and to remain with Council and Mayor having annual discretion to appropriate an amount beyond the current Charter mandated amount in order to provide budgetary flexibility during economic uncertainty and in recognition of anticipated increased funding needs. The Mayor and Council can decide, at any time, to provide additional General Fund support to RAP or, as a matter of policy, waive the reimbursement of General Fund related costs. Both would have the net effect of providing additional resources to RAP while maintaining budgetary flexibility, especially during this critical period. The City's four-year forecast currently projects a deficit over the next few years. Further, substantial budgetary obligations are on the horizon, including the Convention Center debt service, homelessness funding, and labor contracts that will be expiring.

If Council were to formally proceed with an increase, CLA recommends that the increase be implemented through ordinance to allow for further discussions on RAP's funding needs and options to meet them. In the near term, the Council and Mayor could request the City Attorney, with assistance from the City Administrative Officer and RAP, to prepare and present an ordinance to establish a multi-year phase in plan, beginning with the 2027-28 Budget, to ultimately reduce RAP's annual reimbursement of related costs and payment of utilities and refuse collection up to \$150M. This ordinance could also include provisions to extend the implementation period if there is a fiscal emergency or to waive the requirement upon Council and Mayor approval. This would have the same effect of providing additional resources to RAP for programming purposes.

If the Committee is committed to a Charter Amendment, the CLA can propose additional language to gradually implement the increase, with provisions for suspension in case of fiscal emergencies. Specifying a minimum percentage for capital costs may also be advisable. Furthermore, should Council choose to move forward with this option, CLA recommends that the percentage rate increase be consistent with the increase the Library Department received through Measure L. In 2011, voters approved a City Charter amendment that increased the Library's Charter mandated appropriation from 0.0175 percent to 0.0300 percent of assessed City property value. This increase was phased in over four years resulting in a 71.4 percent increase in the Library's Charter mandated appropriation. A similar increase to RAP would result in the Charter mandated appropriation increasing from 0.0325 percent to 0.0557 percent of assessed City property value. According to RAP's Park Needs Assessment (CF 25-1538), such an increase would not only enable RAP to restore peak service levels achieved in FY 2008 but also increase its capacity to meet anticipated demand and elevate overall service delivery for the current Park system.

During the meeting, the Committee supported amending the Charter to increase RAP's Charter mandated appropriation in a phased in manner along with an option for suspension in certain situations. The minimum Charter mandated appropriation for FY 2024-25, based on 0.0325

percent of assessed value of City property, was approximately \$278M. The proposed increase of the Charter-mandated appropriation from 0.0325 percent to 0.0650 percent would have resulted in a FY 2024-25 Charter mandated appropriation of approximately \$556M. As requested, a comparison between a four year and six year phased in increases for these dollar amounts along with percentage rates are provided below.

FOUR (4) YEAR PHASED INCREASE TO RAP CHARTER MANDATED APPROPRIATION PERCENTAGE, FROM 0.0325% to 0.065%, IN FY 2024-25 DOLLARS				
Year	Appropriation Percentage	Incremental Percentage Increase	Incremental Appropriation Amount	Appropriation Amount
0	0.0325%	0.0000%	\$ -	\$ 277,877,091
1	0.0406%	0.0081%	\$ 69,255,521	\$ 347,132,612
2	0.0487%	0.0081%	\$ 69,255,521	\$ 416,388,133
3	0.0568%	0.0081%	\$ 69,255,521	\$ 485,643,654
4	0.0650%	0.0082%	\$ 70,110,528	\$ 555,754,182

SIX (6) YEAR PHASED INCREASE TO RAP CHARTER MANDATED APPROPRIATION PERCENTAGE, FROM 0.0325% to 0.065%, IN FY 2024-25 DOLLARS				
Year	Appropriation Percentage	Incremental Percentage Increase	Incremental Appropriation Amount	Appropriation Amount
0	0.0325%	0.0000%	\$ -	\$ 277,877,091
1	0.0379%	0.0054%	\$ 46,170,347	\$ 324,047,438
2	0.0433%	0.0054%	\$ 46,170,347	\$ 370,217,786
3	0.0487%	0.0054%	\$ 46,170,347	\$ 416,388,133
4	0.0541%	0.0054%	\$ 46,170,347	\$ 462,558,481
5	0.0595%	0.0054%	\$ 46,170,347	\$ 508,728,828
6	0.0650%	0.0055%	\$ 47,025,354	\$ 555,754,182

RAP's FY 2024-25 Budget totaled \$348M, which included the Charter mandated appropriation of \$278M and \$70M in other revenue generated by the Department. RAP's Park Needs Assessment (CF 25-1538) states that a FY 2024-25 Budget of \$454M would have allowed them to provide FY 2008 peak service levels. Based on cost and funding models of their FY 2024-25 Budget, this level of funding would have required an appropriation rate of 0.0449 percent or a Charter mandated appropriation of \$384M, resulting in a total Budget of \$454M; this is approximately 30 percent less than the \$556M resulting from an appropriation rate of 0.0650 percent.

As requested, in order to ensure the City is able to respond to fiscal emergencies, the following language has been drafted for the temporary suspension of the Charter mandated appropriation, should the Council wish to proceed in this direction.

Up to 30 percent of the annual Charter mandated appropriation, may be suspended for a fiscal year in the event: (i) the City adopts a resolution declaring a fiscal emergency; or (ii) the City makes a withdrawal from the Budget Stabilization Fund.

This language would allow for any suspension to not fall below the amount necessary for RAP to provide their FY 2008 peak service levels. Alternatively, the language could specify that the mandated appropriation not fall below the original 0.0325 percent of assessed value of City property in the event of fiscal distress.

Finally, it is important to note that the amounts presented herein are based on the 2024-25 Parks Needs Assessment. Since that time, assessed property values have increased. The 2026-27 Adopted Budget provides a Charter appropriation of \$303M; if the 0.0650 percent were in effect, RAP would require an appropriation of \$606M. Since this measure would not generate new General Fund revenues, any additional General Fund appropriation to RAP mandated by this proposed Charter amendment would have to come from economic growth or be redirected from other existing programs.

Recommendation

1. Note and file.
2. Alternatively, if the Council wishes to formalize additional annual support for RAP, revise the Administrative Code with amendments as discussed in this report.

CRC 5 – Allow RAP to sell or transfer non-parkland through a streamlined process
Amends Charter Section 594

This proposed Charter amendment would revise Charter Section 594 to create a less cumbersome process for transferring properties/lands under the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) that are determined not viable for use for public recreation or open space, therefore allowing the land to be converted into other community serving uses such as affordable housing. The Commission's Charter amendment proposes that property conversion occur subject to an action by the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioner (Board) with Council approval; or through the adoption of a Council motion, provided that the future use complies with the California Surplus Land Act, serves the public interest, and meets other requirements. The RAP recommends modifying the proposed language to clarify that in the event a land transfer is initiated by Council motion, the determination that such land is not viable for use for public recreation or open space be made by both the Council and the Board.

The Committee supported amending the Charter for this purpose, although additional language was requested on the deliberative process, specifically how determinations are made in the event there is a disagreement between the Board and the Council. As currently written, the language proposed by the Commission grants the Board final control of the decision when they are in disagreement with the Council. Furthermore, the proposed language makes it easier for the sale and transfer of non-parkland. The sale of RAP properties should be protected.

The Charter states that lands designated as public parks must permanently remain for public use, though the Board can authorize specific exceptions. Furthermore, the Charter states that if the City wants to remove land from dedicated park status, both the Board and Council must determine that the land is unsuitable for park uses, and an area of land at least equal in size must be acquired in the same part of the City and dedicated as a new public park. The Commission eliminated the requirement that an equivalent amount of land be added as dedicated park or open space.

The Commission proposal allows that land not identified for development for park or open space uses would be eligible for transfer to other purposes. This does not provide protections for some of the wider range of open space purposes that are not associated with development. Disposal of dedicated park land without carefully structured criteria for the evaluation of land prior to a disposition action could inadvertently deprive residents of park resources that have value.

This proposal may have a Fiscal Impact depending on the specific parcels approved for sale/transfer. If a parcel of parkland is sold/transferred that has existing obligations (acquired through a grant or special funding source with binding covenants), it is possible that RAP or the City's General Fund may be required to reimburse a funding source.

Recommendation

Further study is required to develop language for a thoughtful process to govern the disposition of unusable Department-owned property.

CRC 6 - Area Planning Commissions

Amends Charter Section 552

This recommendation proposes to amend Charter Section 552 to delete all references to the Area Planning Commissions (APCs), which currently consists of 35 appointed and confirmed Commissioners, and replace the APCs with a single, five-member commission to be known as the Neighborhood Appeals Commission (NAC). Additionally, this proposed recommendation concurrently amends the authority previously granted to the APCs and proposes to grant this amended authority to the proposed NAC.

At its meeting on May 5, 2026, the Rules Committee did not take any action. To effectuate the recommendation, a Charter amendment is required.

This recommendation will concentrate land use authority in one non-elected five member Commission. In 1999, the Charter was amended to replace the Board of Zoning Appeals with the APCs. This recommendation, then, is a return to the oversight structure that existed prior to 1999. APCs have now been in place for twenty-seven years and currently consist of 35 Commissioners who were appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by Council. The removal of the APCs may resurrect arguments that land use decision making is centralized in City Hall and ignores local neighborhoods, as was argued by past secession movements in various parts of the City in the 1990s and early 2000s. Local neighborhoods may argue that the new Commission will not represent their land use interests since they are disconnected from the geography wherein projects are proposed.

In addition, this recommendation proposes to change the standard of review in Section 552 as to appeals from error or abuse of discretion to *de novo*. This represents a change in the level of deference given to the initial decisionmaker. Allowing the NAC to consider a matter *de novo* allows the appellate body to consider the whole matter, on its own, and without deference to the initial decision maker.

Changing the standard of review from error or abuse of discretion to *de novo* would effectively decrease the amount of deference given to the initial decisionmaker, inasmuch as *de novo* requires no deference at all. One concern could be that the initial decisionmaker, such as the Zoning Administrator, is equipped with the technical expertise and experience to make its determinations and therefore merits deference. This is acutely at issue in light of the fact that neither the APCs' or the proposed NAC' Commissioners or members are subject to requirements on qualifications or experience to serve in their respective positions.

Recommendation:

Note and File. Approval of this recommendation to eliminate the seven APCs and its 35 Commissioners will concentrate Citywide land use authority on one non-elected five-member decision-making body, reducing local control.

CRC 7 – Council Veto Authority

Amends Charter Section 245(e)

This recommendation proposes a 30 day time limit when the Council remands an item to the City Planning Commission or Neighborhood Appeals Commission after asserting jurisdiction. It requires Commissions to take action within 30 days to concur or dissent with Council, and thereafter, the matter is referred to the Council for a final vote. Upon re-referral from the Commission, the Council must act within 21 days or the action of the Commission on remand becomes final.

At its meeting on May 5, 2026, the Rules Committee did not take any action, and requested a memorandum from the CLA on whether time limit references can be changed from number of days to number of meetings. To effectuate the recommendation, a Charter amendment is required.

Question: Can the time limit references in CRC 7 be changed from number of days to number of meetings?

Yes. Charter Section 245 currently provides a mix of days and meetings to establish time limitations. Charter Section 245 establishes that actions of boards shall become final at the expiration of the next five meeting days of the Council during which the Council has convened in regular session, unless the Council acts within that time to bring the action before it or to waive review of the action. On the other hand, Charter Sections 245(a) and (c) state that if Council timely asserts jurisdiction over the action, the Council may **veto and remand** the action of the originating board within 21 calendar days of voting to bring the matter before it, or the action of the board shall become final.

The proposed amendment provides a new 30 day time limit for the City Planning Commission or the proposed Neighborhood Appeals Commission (NAC) to act if Council vetoes and remands the matter. Council then has 21 calendar days to act before the CPC or NAC action on remand becomes final.

An issue with changing the time limit from number of days to number of meetings is that the **proposed CRC 7 assumes the passage of CRC 6**, which proposes to replace the Area Planning Commissions with the NAC. Currently there is nothing in any of the proposed amendments that establishes how often the NAC will meet. Moreover, if CRC 6 is not adopted and the APCs are therefore retained, then an assessment of the impacts of changing the number of meetings would be required, as there are some APCs that do not meet at regular intervals.

Recommendation:

Note and File. There are serious concerns as it relates to Council's authority because 245(e) is unique inasmuch as it enables the Council to 'step into the shoes' of the underlying body and act on the matter with the same authority as originally held by the APC or CPC. Assertion of jurisdiction allows Council an additional opportunity to vet the matter via a public hearing with stakeholder participation. It is unclear if the proposal will dilute the Council's land use authority in cases where the Council cannot act within 21 calendar days, as the actions of the CPC or the proposed NAC (if the APCs are eliminated) on remand becomes final after 21 days, thereby depriving an opportunity of review from the City Council.

CRC 8 - General Plan Amendments

Amends Charter Section 555

This recommendation proposes to create a new 75-day time limit for Council to act on a proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA) that has received approval from the City Planning Commission and the Mayor, and deems Council's failure to act within the time limit as an approval of the GPA. While the Municipal Code currently prescribes a 75-day time limit for Council to act, the Municipal Code deems a failure to act as a disapproval of the GPA.

At its meeting on May 5, 2026, the Rules Committee did not take any action. A Charter Amendment is not required to effectuate this recommendation, as such a change can be accomplished by amending the Municipal Code.

This recommendation undermines the Council's authority as it equates a failure to act as an approval. As proposed, Council will not have the opportunity to consider and review a proposed GPA if Council fails to act within the 75-day time limit. In such instances, the Councilmember(s) representing the Council District impacted by a proposed GPA would be unable to provide input or review, which may be a concern, particularly for GPAs that update Community Plans, given that the Councilmember is elected and accountable to their constituents. This may present issues when there is a change in the Councilmember representing the Council District, as the incoming Councilmember may not have sufficient time to consider the proposed GPA.

Moreover, the City Attorney has raised concerns that this proposed recommendation is potentially problematic as it relates to the environmental clearance as required for proposed projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and questions its consistency with the Government Code. As to the CEQA issue, CEQA mandates may create a confusing process in cases where the environmental clearance of a proposed GPA is appealed. State law requires Council to affirmatively act on a CEQA appeal. As such, if the only entitlement for a proposed project is a GPA and its CEQA clearance is appealed, Council will need to decide the CEQA appeal even if the GPA is already approved by operation of this proposed recommendation. If the CEQA appeal is upheld by Council, the GPA would need to be subsequently voided, regardless of what this proposed recommendation provides, because a project approval cannot exist without CEQA.

Recommendation:

Note and File. Approval of this recommendation dilutes Council's land use authority to review GPAs and presents issues relating to CEQA. At the same time, no Charter amendment is required as the proposal could be implemented through the Municipal Code via an ordinance.

CRC 9 - Floor Area Restriction Limitations

Amends Charter Section 104(e)

This recommendation proposes to grant Council the authority to exceed the existing Floor Area Restriction (FAR) of 13:1 limitation via ordinance. In addition, this recommendation proposes to allow Council, by ordinance, to further restrict, regulate, and amend the total floor area, building area, and height or bulk of buildings or structures.

The FAR limitation of 13:1 is an outdated restriction that originated in the 1950s in response to the removal of Citywide height limits. Removing this restriction will allow the City to accommodate denser development in Regional Centers where the most intense density is currently allowed, such as Downtown, Hollywood, or Century City, and could facilitate the construction of much needed housing.

At its meeting on May 5, 2026, the Rules Committee did not take any action, and requested a report from the City Attorney to clarify whether moving this provision from the Charter to the Municipal Code would trigger environmental review under CEQA. To effectuate the recommendation, a Charter amendment is required.

Recommendation:

Present to voters in November 2026. If adopting the proposed recommendation, ADOPT with the following language as the environmental clearance: "DETERMINE that the Floor Area Restriction Limitation Amendment is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines sections 15378(b)(5) (organizational or administrative activities of governments) and 15061(b)(3) (common sense exemption)."

CRC 10 - Quasi-Judicial Decisionmaking

Amends Charter Sections 561 through 565

This recommendation proposes to amend the Charter Section relating to the Office of Zoning Administration by granting the Planning Department the authority to investigate, hear, and determine all applications for quasi-judicial review, and the responsibility of independent review and approval, conditional approval or denial of quasi-judicial applications. In addition, this recommendation proposes to grant the Planning Director the authority to appoint, subject to the civil service provisions of the Charter, designated Planning staff to perform the duties of quasi-judicial review. Such staff shall include, but is not limited to, the Office of Zoning Administration, a Deputy Advisory Agency, and Hearing Officers.

Concurrently, this recommendation proposes to delete in its entirety Charter Sections 562-565. Charter Sections 562-564 currently provide for the initial decisionmaker, processes, and appeals governing variances, conditional use permits and other similar quasi-judicial approvals, and projects requiring multiple approvals. The Planning Department was asked to confirm whether the new Zoning Code, Chapter 1A, includes the same procedures and appeal rights for variances and CUPs or other similar quasi-judicial approvals, as what is currently in Charter Sections 562 and 563. Charter Section 565 provides the authority of the CPC to delegate legislative authority to APCs and states that the CPC may adopt rules and regulations, subject to approval by ordinance, identifying classes or categories of legislative actions for projects determined not to have Citywide impact, and provides for action on those projects to be taken by an APC instead.

At its meeting on May 5, 2026, the Rules Committee did not take any action, and requested further clarification from the CLA as to what aspects of the appeals process could be located in the Charter versus the Municipal Code, and whether moving aspects of the Charter to the Municipal Code would create conflicts with State law. To effectuate the recommendation, a Charter amendment is required.

Committee Question: What aspects of the appeals process can be in the Charter versus the Municipal Code? Would moving aspects of the Charter to the Municipal Code conflict with State law?

Response to Committee Question: Whether to include appeal processes in the Charter or the Municipal Code is a policy decision. Of note is the manner in which the Charter and Municipal Code can be amended. Per State law, any proposed amendment to the Charter must be submitted to the voters at an established Statewide general election. By contrast, the Municipal Code can be amended by ordinance.

All appeals processes are included in the Municipal Code as part of Chapter 1 (Zoning Code) or Chapter 1A (New Zoning Code). The Processes and Procedures Ordinance, though not yet effective Citywide, established Article 13 of Chapter 1A of the Municipal Code as a central location for the processes and procedures that govern the City's consideration of entitlements and appeals. Inasmuch as the City Attorney prepared and presented the draft Ordinance, it was assessed for any conflicts with State law.

In addition, CLA staff consulted with the Planning Department and the City Attorney, and they confirmed that **the only appeals that are mandated by State law are: (1) CEQA appeals and (2) Division of land appeals pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act.**

Recommendation:

Further study is required to assess the impacts of the new authorities granted to the Planning Department and deletions of Charter Sections 562-565.

Question: Are there elements of the appeals process that can be automated so that there are no conflicts between the Department and appellants (e.g., size of the width of a street)? Consideration should be given to how this can reshape the appeals process, and striking a balance between protecting communities and preventing frivolous appeals.

Automation can be challenging to implement in the appeals process, inasmuch as a decisionmaker on an appeal hears evidence and arguments from at least two opposing parties and ultimately makes a decision that is inherently discretionary.

In contrast, ministerial actions involve only the nondiscretionary application of objective standards and thus may be more conducive to the scenario presented by the Chair wherein the Department and applicant can resolve issues of fact without an appeal. The nature of the ministerial application and review lends itself to avoiding the kind of conflicts that are present in appeals as issues can be resolved according to objective standards that could be relied upon to make a determination one way or another. Moreover, there are no appeals of ministerial actions.

Recommendation:

Further study is required to assess the feasibility of automating elements of the appeal processes, which could include a comprehensive review of the universe of appeals and the levels of review; an assessment of each appeal type and its elements for automation; and weighing the pros of limiting appeal elements against the cons of foregoing additional levels of review or providing communities with an opportunity to challenge.

CRC 13 – Chief Financial Officer

Amends Charter Sections 290, 291, 292, 293

The purpose of this recommendation by the Commission is to designate a Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for the City. The Commission also recommends changes to the appointment and the term of service for the CAOs. Though the City Administrative Officer (CAO) currently operates in the capacity of CFO, the Commission determined that clarity on the matter would be important.

Though not necessary to make such a determination by Charter, the Council could clarify the matter by doing so. It is not necessary to change the official title of the CAO by including the title of CFO. The role could be assigned among the Powers and Duties of the CAO. The Commission also defined a range of studies and plans that the CAO should develop as part of the two-year budget. In its deliberations, the Committee determined that many of the details regarding the City budget process should be included in the Administrative Code rather than the Charter. Therefore, it is recommended that Section 291 not include details about budget

documents to be prepared by the CAO, but that the Administrative Code contain the required assignments and associated details.

Upon consideration, the Committee recommended clarifying the role of CFO as a responsibility of the CAO. The Committee determined that the remaining proposed changes be noted and filed. Refer to CRC 59 and 60 regarding the Two-Year Budget for additional information and recommendations. Additionally, on discussion of this matter with the CAO, it was determined that the Charter should also clearly assign duties related to debt management to the CAO.

Recommendation:

Present to voters in November 2026. Amend Section 291 to include “Chief Financial Officer” role, the development of a Capital Improvement Program, and debt management among the Powers and Duties of the CAO, and note and file the remaining proposed revisions in Section 291 in favor of revisions associated with CRC 59 and CRC 60 regarding the Two-Year Budget.

CRC 14 – Bifurcation of City Attorney Roles.

Amends Charter Sections 200, 201, 202, 205, 206, 210, 218, 270, 271, 272

Adds Sections 271, 274, 275,

The Charter Reform Commission proposed to divide the responsibilities of the City Attorney as currently organized between newly created independent offices of a City Attorney and a City Prosecutor. The proposed Charter amendments would add an elected “City Prosecutor” and establish the Office of the City Attorney to be appointed and removed pursuant to Charter Section 508. The appointed City Attorney would be responsible for civil litigation matters, legal counsel, and legislative affairs; an elected City Prosecutor would oversee criminal prosecutions.

Amendments to the Charter would be required in order to establish a stand-alone elected “City Prosecutor” to the Charter and to transition the City Attorney from an elected position to one that is appointed as well as to outline the responsibilities of both offices.

The Committee supported bifurcating the City Attorney’s Office. The Committee requested the Office of the City Attorney to provide additional information about the costs to implement this change. The Committee also requested additional information about the cases handled by the Public Rights Branch and whether those cases are filed in the name of the People or the City in order to determine which Office the Branch would be assigned to. These issues are discussed further below. The Committee also discussed the feasibility of including an Office of Legislative Counsel within the Chief Legislative Analyst’s Office

Committee Question: How much would it cost to bifurcate the City Attorney’s Office into two separate offices, that of a municipal City Attorney and of a City Prosecutor?

Response to Committee Question: The City Attorney’s Office reports that the total yearly personnel costs including salary and benefits for the two offices would increase by approximately \$15M to \$17M per year above that of the currently unified Office of the City Attorney. The increase is attributed to an approximate doubling of “back-office” personnel (e.g.,

in finance and operations, business office, HR, payroll, technology, and library services) and “front-office” personnel (e.g., chief-of-staff, chief deputies, legislative deputy, communications team members).

The City Attorney’s Office reports that additional time is required to analyze and estimate the one-time and occasional increases in costs attributed to approximately doubling back- and front-office equipment needs (e.g., for purchasing, installing, maintaining, repairing, and replacing computers, printers, IT equipment, etc.).

Our Office agrees that additional time is needed in order to thoroughly analyze the impact of bifurcating the roles of the City Attorney, including the estimated costs of dividing the office and establishing a new Office of the City Prosecutor. The establishment of the Office of the City Prosecutor would likely have administrative, departmental, and financial impacts resulting from the need to create a new City office. Currently, the 2026-27 Adopted Budget allocates \$70.2M of the City Attorney Office’s total budget of \$193.7M for Criminal and Special Litigation. The remaining funds are allocated to Municipal Law (\$44.3M); Real Estate (\$4.3M); Public Rights (\$1.7M); Proprietary and Outside Counsel (\$24.3M); Civil Liability Management (\$39.6M); and General Administration and Support (\$9.3M). As the City Attorney’s Office noted, Further study is required on the positions and resources that may be transferred to the new Office of the City Prosecutor, additional resources or positions that may be needed in both offices as a result of the bifurcation, and the staff and resources, if any, that could be shared between the offices. Additionally, the City may need to meet and confer with the labor organizations on the proposed bifurcation.

The Charter Commission also did not provide any proposed amendments to Charter Section 1050 that relates to Employment in the City Attorney’s Office. This section may need to be amended should the Council proceed with bifurcating the office. The changes to this section and other Charter sections related to the City Attorney’s Office will need to be reviewed to determine the appropriate amendments in order to effectuate the bifurcation.

Lastly, our Office also recommends that the discussion related to establishing an Office of Legislative Counsel be further studied as the cost and responsibilities of such an office are unknown at this time. It would also be necessary to ensure that differing legal opinions between offices do not create conflicts for the City.

Committee Question: What are the number of Unfair Competition (so-called “17200 cases”) and other Public Rights Branch cases brought in the name of the People or City?

Response to Committee Question: The Office of the City Attorney reports that since its formation in May 2023, the Public Rights Branch (Branch) has resolved more than a thousand matters without filing litigation including price gouging, copper wire reseller compliance letters, nuisance abatement (gang, gun violence, trafficking, narcotics, party houses and rental violations), and consumer protection matters (harmful consumer products, unlawful fireworks, etc.). The Branch currently has 60 significant matters under investigation, and is monitoring an additional 40 settlements (including the City’s share of the multibillion dollar opioid settlements). Since May 2023, the Branch has initiated 62 civil prosecution cases in the name of

the People, seven cases in the name of the City, and will soon be filing its second case in the name of *both* the People and the City. The Branch's litigation cases are usually large and complex and often take years to resolve.

The City Attorney notes that even the matters that are informally resolved without litigation require extensive work to achieve a favorable result. The 450 demand letters on price gouging resulted in extensive discussions with property representatives to ensure legal compliance and the return of overcharges. The Branch prioritizes restitution to the victims over penalties in these types of situations. Currently, the Branch has 26 authorized and 25 filled attorney positions, and 15 authorized and 14 filled staff positions. Each of the pending cases is staffed with two to four attorneys from the Branch.

Recommendation

Further study is required related to the costs associated with bifurcating the Office of the City Attorney and establishing an Office of the City Prosecutor; the impact bifurcation would have on various functions within the office; any Meet and Confer items with labor organizations; and how certain branches may be assigned between the offices.

CRC 18 - Increase the Time Limit for Temporary Transfer of Employees to 365 Days
Amends Charter Section 233

The CRC's recommendation proposes to amend Section 233 to extend the time limit from 120 days to 365 days by which the Mayor can make temporary transfers of employees from one appointed office or department to another appointed office or department to address personnel needs.

Currently, Section 233 of the Charter provides for the temporary transfer of personnel by the Mayor from one department, bureau or office to another, except for proprietary departments. These transfers are for the purpose of alleviating shortages of personnel or temporary demands caused by temporary or seasonal requirements. Per Section 233, transfers are not to exceed 120 days in a calendar year. As it relates to costs, the department, bureau or office to which the employee temporarily transfers pays the salary of the employee during the period of the transfer.

During the Committee's deliberations on this proposal, the Committee asked about what would happen to an employee following the conclusion of the 120-day transfer period and whether the transferred employee would return to their originating department. The CAO noted that the Mayor has the authority to extend this appointment at the conclusion of the 120-day time limit.

Recommendation:

Note and file.

CRC 26 – Ethics Commission Inspector General

Adds Charter Section 713

The Commission report recommends establishing the position of Inspector General of the Ethics Commission with the power and duty to audit and investigate City officials and departments both on instruction from and independent from the Commission.

Committee Question: How does the proposed Charter language conflict with current ethics enforcement?

Response to Committee Question: As proposed, an Inspector General of the Ethics Commission would hold audit and investigative powers over all City Departments and elected offices. They would be first among inspector generals, and have the ability to perform their own investigative activities on behalf of, or independent from, the Commission.

At present, the Ethics Commission relies on auditing and investigation actions of City officials and departments from individual inspector generals that are assigned to specific departments; as an example, the Board of Police Commissioners is reliant on investigations and reporting from their own inspector general. Should there be an Inspector General of the Ethics Commission, in addition to the City Controller and Inspectors General in other Departments, the effect of these overlapping duties is that a single program could be subject to multiple audits by multiple City entities, either subsequently or concurrently, in a manner that could be disruptive to program delivery.

The proposed Inspector General position would hold audit and investigation authority for, and independent from, the Ethics Commission. However, the Ethics Commission already employs a Director of Enforcement with similar duties and powers, though the current Director is focused on the current authority of the Ethics Commission. Creating an Inspector General position may prove to be duplicative of the Director of Enforcement's role, and create questions of ultimate authority between the positions.

The authority provided to the Inspector General in the Charter Commission proposal is far more expansive than the Charter role of the Ethics Commission. While the Ethics Commission is charged with investigating conflicts of interest and compliance issues related to City employees and elected officials, the proposed Charter language provides the Inspector General with the authority to execute performance audits on City programs including those operated by elected officials. Committee members noted that any performance audit could be misconstrued as political. Additionally, because these powers have some overlap with the Controller, any investigation could be seen as superseding the work of the Controller.

Finally, the proposed amendment would allow Council to refer investigations to the Inspector General by two-thirds vote. At present, any Councilmember individually can request an investigation by the Director of Enforcement without a vote of Council. Therefore, this amendment would significantly diminish the authority of Council to refer investigation inquiries.

If the Ethics Commission Inspector General position is approved as proposed, the Ethics Commission would require significantly more staff and funding to execute their new duties as this would be a major expansion of their authority.

Recommendation

Note and file.

CRC 27 – Election Prohibitions for Former Ethics Commission Members

Amends Charter Section 700

The Commission report recommends increasing the prohibitions on the Ethics Commissioners and its Executive Director with regard to seeking election for office in the City or the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Board of Education.

At present, Ethics Commissioners are prohibited from seeking election to any City office or LAUSD Board of Education office for at least two years subsequent to the end of their term as a Commissioner. This prohibition is intended to separate the actions of an individual Commissioner from influence of a pending political campaign.

The proposed amendment would extend this prohibition from two years to five. Additionally, the Commission's Executive Director shall not seek election to such office unless the election for that office is to be held at least five years following the expiration of their term.

The Committee did not discuss this item.

Recommendation

Present to voters in November 2026.

CRC 28 – Ethics Commission Legal Counsel

Amends Charter Section 708

The Commission report recommends authorizing the Commission to retain its own general counsel independent of the City Attorney.

At present the Ethics Commission relies on the City Attorney for legal services, with the exception of investigative work for which the Commission can retain outside counsel. Considering the independent nature of the Ethics Commission's duties, allowing a City department that may be the subject of a Commission investigation or audit to provide general legal counsel could present a conflict of interest.

The proposed amendment would provide authorization for the Ethics Commission to retain its own general counsel independent of the City Attorney. No direct funding is provided for the Commission to retain counsel. However, CRC recommendation 29 would increase the Commission's annual appropriation from \$7 million to \$10 million, which could be used in part on legal services.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA, in consultation with the Ethics Commission, to report back on the implication of the Ethics Commission having an independent counsel and how they would work with the City Attorney's office, including in a scenario where the City Attorney's office is bifurcated. Analysis should include fiscal impact.

CRC 29 – Ethics Commission Appropriation

Amends Charter Section 711

The Commission report recommends increasing the minimum appropriation of the Ethics Commission's annual operating budget from \$7 million to \$10 million.

At present, the Ethics Commission receives a \$7 million appropriation for the annual operating budget for each fiscal year. These funds are allocated independently of the budget process in order to ensure the Commission's independence from political influence. This baseline funding was approved by the voters in November 2024 and will adjust annually based on changes to City revenues unless exigent circumstances exist.

The proposed amendment would increase this amount to \$10 million to further fund the activities of the Ethics Commission, including the potential engagement of the proposed general counsel and Inspector General, respectively (CRC 26 and 28, respectively).

Both the CAO and the CLA advise against increasing the funding obligation in the Charter. The Charter was just recently amended to establish the \$7M baseline. Further, the Mayor and Council may make additional funding decisions in the budget process. The City often encounters financial challenges that require flexibility in allocating resources. Placing funding commitments in the Charter reduces the ability of the Mayor and Council to be flexible in addressing those financial challenges.

Recommendation

Note and file.

CRC 30 - Suspension of Elected Officers

Amends Charter Section 211

The CRC is recommending that Charter Section 211 be revised to establish procedures concerning the Council's ability to suspend any elected officer against whom felony criminal proceedings or criminal misdemeanor proceedings have been filed related to a violation of their official duties. More specifically, the CRC's proposal aims to clarify the suspension process by establishing that a Councilmember may introduce a resolution with stated findings of misconduct that would serve as justification for the proposed suspension. The resolution must then be heard by the Council within seven calendar days of its introduction and adopted by three-fourths of the Council in order to effectuate the suspension.

By including these suspension provisions, the CRC seeks to prevent confusion by clarifying vague language in the Charter, ensuring due process, and increasing accountability. The CRC's

proposal also notes that there shall be no changes to the compensation of the elected officer, and states that the suspension shall end if the charges are dismissed or the elected official is acquitted.

Currently, Charter Section 211 states that pending trial, the Council may suspend any elected officer against whom felony criminal proceedings or criminal misdemeanor proceedings have occurred related to a violation of their official duties. Although the Council has exercised this authority in the past, the process for enacting a suspension is not clearly outlined. The Administrative Code and City Council Rules are also silent on the process for suspension. In instances where a suspension has occurred, Councilmembers have introduced Motions, which were then approved by a majority vote of the Council.

Please note that when a suspension occurs pursuant to Charter Section 211, the office is considered to be temporarily vacant, so that officeholders can return to their office should the grounds for the suspension no longer exist. An office is considered permanently vacant when an officeholder is removed pursuant to the conditions outlined in Charter Section 207. In the event of a temporary vacancy, the Council has at times chosen to fill the vacancy pursuant to Charter Section 409, which authorizes the Council to fill a vacancy by appointing an individual to hold an office.

Should the Council choose to move forward with this proposal, additional consideration should be given as to the length of the suspension, whether the Council could choose to vote to end the suspension, and the voting threshold to end a suspension. As it relates to the length of the suspension for Councilmembers, the Committee may consider adding a time limit whereby a voting or non-voting representative should be appointed to fill the seat in order to ensure that the constituents of the Council District are represented on the Council and/or their concerns are addressed regarding the day-to-day management of the Council District. Furthermore, a provision should be included that would allow the Council to end a suspension if they so choose. Currently, the CRC proposal states that a suspension shall end if the charges are dismissed or the elected official is acquitted. Including a provision that allows the Council to end a suspension provides greater flexibility and discretion, allowing the Council to assess a suspension based on the facts at hand. If a provision to end a suspension is included, the Committee may also wish to consider establishing a voting threshold to overturn a suspension, which could be by a majority, two-thirds, or three-fourths vote of the Council.

Further, the Commission's recommendation includes a provision that states that the resolution concerning a suspension must be heard by the Council within seven calendar days. This language does not take into account issues associated with timing as it relates to holidays, weekends, or days for when Council is in recess. In order to retain flexibility, it is recommended that if the Council chooses to move forward with this proposal, the proposed language should be amended to make reference to a set amount of Council meeting days rather than calendar days for when a proposed suspension should be considered by the Council.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA, in conjunction with the City Attorney, to report with options on whether the suspension provisions for elected officers should be

included in the Administrative Code or should be further defined in the Charter. This report should include additional consideration as to the length of the suspension, whether the Council could choose to vote to end the suspension, and the appropriate voting thresholds to end a suspension.

CRC 31 - Appointment of a Non-Voting Manager; Suspended Councilmembers

Adds Charter Section 211.1

The CRC is recommending the addition of a new section in the Charter that would create a process for the appointment of a non-voting temporary manager for a Council Office in the event of a suspension, clarifying the temporary appointment process in the event that a Councilmember is suspended, pursuant to Charter Section 211. Per the CRC's proposal, a Councilmember may introduce a Motion to appoint a person to serve as the non-voting temporary manager/caretaker of the Council Office. Once introduced, the proposal states that the Motion shall be heard and voted on by the Council within seven calendar days. If approved, the term of the temporary manager/caretaker shall run concurrently with the duration of the Councilmember's suspension.

At this time, the Charter and Administrative Code do not have provisions outlining the appointment of a temporary non-voting caretaker in the event of a suspension. Historically, when a vacancy or temporary vacancy has occurred on the Council, the Council President has designated a non-voting caretaker to assist with the day-to-day management of the Council Office. The designated caretaker serves in an administrative capacity until the suspension has concluded or a new Councilmember has been elected to serve in the office. The current process for designating a caretaker helps to depoliticize the appointment process when a vacancy occurs on the Council. Establishing a formal legislative process as proposed by the Commission could politicize a role that is meant to serve in an administrative capacity.

In addition to the current practice of appointing a non-voting temporary manager or caretaker, the Council has also chosen to appoint a voting member to fill a temporary vacancy in an office. When this has occurred, the Council has included conditions stating that the appointee would fill the office until the suspension ends. However, it should be noted that the Charter currently does not include provisions that discuss the nature, manner, or conditions associated with the appointment of an individual to hold an office in the event of a temporary vacancy. Consideration should be given as to what would occur if a suspension ends and the office is occupied by an appointee. At this time, it is questionable as to whether the appointee would be required to vacate the office when a suspension concludes in order to allow for the original Councilmember to return to their office. Although the CRC's proposal discusses the appointment of a non-voting temporary manager, the Council should also consider whether provisions should be included that address the appointment of an individual to hold the office as a voting member in the event of a temporary vacancy. This proposal also includes a provision stating that a Motion relative to the appointment of a non-voting temporary manager must be heard and considered by the Council within seven calendar days. Similar to the concerns discussed in CRC 30 above, it is recommended that if the Council chooses to move forward with this proposal, the proposed language should be amended to reference a set amount of Council meeting days instead of calendar days for when a Motion must be considered by the Council.

The CRC's proposed provisions specifically discuss the appointment of a non-voting caretaker on the Council, but do not address appointments as it relates to suspensions in the offices of the Mayor, City Controller, or City Attorney. Should a suspension occur in any of the Citywide offices, it is unclear how a temporary appointment could occur. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Mayor, Charter Section 243 allows for the President of the City Council to act as the Mayor of the City. For the offices of the City Attorney and City Controller, Charter Section 210 states that those offices shall designate an assistant or deputy, who shall become the acting incumbent in the case of a vacancy in those offices. The Council may wish to further instruct this Office to report on potential options concerning Council's ability to temporarily appoint an individual to Citywide elected offices as a result of a suspension.

Committee Question: What is the historical context of how vacancies have been handled on the City Council?

Response to Committee Question: Over the last 40 years, when a vacancy has occurred on the Council, the Council President has designated a non-voting caretaker for the Council District to assist with the day-to-day management of the Council Office. The caretaker serves in that capacity until a new Councilmember has been elected to serve in the office. Typically, when a vacancy has occurred on the City Council, the Council President has designated the CLA as the caretaker for the Council District. Since 1995, the CLA has served as the caretaker in 13 instances for various Council Offices. While serving as caretaker, the CLA acts in an administrative capacity, ensuring that the day-to-day functions (e.g., staff management, payment of invoices, establishment of positions on district-specific planning issues, etc.) of the Council Office are addressed in a timely manner. In addition to the CLA, on two occasions the Council President has also appointed senior staff members from the vacant Council Office to serve as the caretakers for their respective districts. There has also been one instance where the Council President has served as the caretaker for the vacant Council Office.

Vacancies on the Council happen on a regular basis, enough that clarifying the procedures to fill a vacancy is advisable. Review of the matter shows that the Commission proposal addresses a portion of the issue. It is important to fully address this matter and ensure that the related concerns of vacancies and procedures to fill vacancies are evaluated concurrently. Further, as it relates to vacancies, this Office has learned that the City's Charter provision surrounding Recall Elections is inconsistent with State law and should be addressed in these sections as well. Currently, the Charter provides that if a recall petition is certified sufficient, then a single election is held both on the question of the recall and to nominate replacement candidates should the recall be approved by the voters. According to the City Attorney's office, the State Elections Code was recently amended to separate the question of recalling an elected official from the process for filling a vacancy as a result of a successful recall. Under the newly revised State law, if a recall is approved by the voters, then the office is deemed vacant and the City must fill the vacancy utilizing its standard vacancy provisions. The Council may wish to revise the City's recall provisions to be consistent with State law. Please note that aligning the City's recall provisions with State law could lead to additional costs associated with calling a separate special election to fill the vacant office, if a recall is approved.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Direction from Council is needed concerning potential refinements to this proposal, as well as alignment of this proposal to CRC 30. Instruct the Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst to report on how the Council should fill an office in the event of temporary vacancy that arises from a suspension pursuant to Charter Section 211. This report should include clarification as to what would occur if a suspension ends and an office is held by an appointment that is made by the Council pursuant to Charter Section 409, as well as conforming the Charter and Elections Code to State law with regard to recall elections.

CRC 32 – Increased Ethics Violation Penalty

Amends Charter Sections 702, 706, and 707

The Commission report recommends increasing and clarifying the penalties imposed due to ethics violations, and restricting campaign funds received for a City or LAUSD Board of Education office from being used to pay said penalties.

At present, those who violate ethics regulations are required to pay a monetary penalty of up to \$15,000, as adjusted annually by the Consumer Price Index starting at the end of calendar year 2027, or three times the amount improperly reported, unlawfully contributed, expended, given, or received. Additionally there is no restriction on those who commit ethics violations from paying monetary penalties with funds received for an election campaign.

The proposed amendment would increase monetary penalties for each violation to the greater of \$15,000 or three times the amount which the person used inappropriately, as adjusted annually. Additionally, the new language restricts violators from paying penalties with campaign funding.

The Ethics Commission noted that they have not opined regarding or provided a recommendation on this Commission proposal.

Committee Question: Didn't Measure ER (2024) already adjust the amount from \$5,000 to \$15,000 (as adjusted annually for CPI)?

Response to Committee Question: Measure ER (2024) adjusted the amounts of administrative penalties; this amendment would clarify that those amounts also apply to civil penalties for ethics violations.

Committee Question: Wouldn't restricting the use of campaign funds to pay for ethics violations create situations in which elected officials are influenced by outside forces?

Response to Committee Question: Committee members questioned the restriction of campaign funds to pay for ethics violations, and whether such a policy could create situations in which an elected official must rely on private interests, outside of the scope of campaign financing law, for such funding. These private interests could influence the actions of elected officials.

Additionally, Committee members noted that this would create a local mandate, as there are no similar State or federal laws.

Recommendation

Present to voters in November 2026.

CRC 33 – Ballot Measure Jurisdiction

Amends Charter Section 703

The Commission report recommends providing the Ethics Commission with the authority to submit ordinance measures directly to voters.

At present, the Ethics Commission retains the ability to propose Charter amendments for public consideration. The Council determines whether these proposals should be presented to the voters, but has no obligation to do so.

The proposed amendment would allow the Ethics Commission to present ballot proposals directly to voters, negating the need for Council to approve such decisions and taking away significant authority for Council to consider and balance proposed measures for a particular ballot.

Ballot initiatives from the Ethics Commission may conflict with ballot measures presented by the Council. This could confuse voters and create potential incompatibility with the Charter were both to be approved. Additionally, bringing proposals to a ballot requires significant financial cost relative to the printing and dissemination of initiative information to the entirety of the City’s voting base. Further, without guidelines on this authority, the Commission could place a wide range of measures before the voters, including measures that have significant funding impacts on the General Fund.

The Committee voted to note and file this recommendation.

Recommendation

Note and file.

CRC 34 – Alignment of City Contribution Limits with LAUSD Adjusted Timelines

Amends Charter Section 470

The Commission report recommends replacing language relative to campaign contribution limits that presently allows for adjustments “from time to time by ordinance” to instead require adjustment review by the Ethics Commission at minimum every four years; and, increasing penalties related to violations of campaign contribution limitations.

At present, campaign contribution limits are adjusted only by ordinance, and on no specific schedule. Additionally, aside from potential civil action brought by the City Attorney, the current limit on imposed penalties to violations of campaign contribution limits is \$2,000.

The proposed Charter amendment would dictate a schedule by which campaign contribution limits must be reviewed. The first review would be required to begin at the end of calendar year 2027, and at least every four years subsequently. The Commission's decision must come by March 1 of the following year, with any changes taking effect by July 1 of that year.

Additionally, the amendment would increase the penalty structure for violations of these limitations. Penalties would now reach an amount of up to the greater of \$15,000 as adjusted annually by the Consumer Price Index starting at the end of calendar year 2027, or three times the amount which the person improperly reported or unlawfully contributed, expended, gave, or received.

No action was recommended by the Committee.

Committee Question: How does delaying and/or limiting inflationary controls benefit the City?

Response to Committee Question: Committee members expressed concern regarding limiting increases to campaign contributions, noting that restricting the amount that can be raised by a Councilmember disadvantages their voice relative to outside financial influences that do not face such restrictions. Council will need to weigh this consideration while determining whether to proceed with an amendment.

Recommendation

Instruct the CLA, in conjunction with the City Attorney, to report back with proposed ordinance language necessary to implement the recommendation in the Administrative Code.

CRC 35 – Removes language referencing matching public funds and adds language that discusses public campaign funding in order to more broadly permit additional public financing models

Amends Charter Section 471

The Commission report recommends altering the language relative to public funding for elections to allow for greater flexibility of public financing models.

At present, the Charter provides for the allocation of the City's General Fund dollars to help fund the electoral campaigns of qualified candidates for City office. These are described as "matching" funds - when a candidate fundraises, the matching funds program will "match" this amount at a ratio of up to 6:1. For example, a \$200 contribution could be matched for up to \$1,200. To receive matching funds, candidates are required to participate in a public debate and receive a minimum number and amount of contributions. Available funds are capped relative to the contested office and whether the election is a primary or general contest.

Such funding is intended to alleviate financial differences between campaigns and allow for a more level political contest. Currently, the Council is required to appropriate \$2,000,000 per fiscal year for such purpose, adjusted by the Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles

Riverside Orange County metropolitan statistical area using 1991 as the base year. The annual appropriation was withheld in the FY 2025-2026 City Budget due to a declared fiscal emergency; Council appropriated the CPI-adjusted amount of \$4,275,471 in the adopted FY2026-27 City Budget.

The proposed Charter amendment would replace references to “matching” funds with “public” funds. This amendment would provide greater flexibility in approach, but would not restrict the public matching funds program as currently instituted for City candidates. This proposal is relative to the California Fair Elections Act of 2026 that seeks to allow jurisdictions to establish public financing programs for campaigns. Jurisdictions would be required to set expenditure limits and criteria; such criteria must include the ability of a candidate to demonstrate broad-based support in their district such as a minimum small-dollar contribution requirement (no more than \$10) or vouchers from a specified number of voting-age residents, but cannot strictly include a specific number of signatures.

The California Fair Elections Act will be presented to voters for consideration on the State ballot for the November 3, 2026 election. The proposed Charter amendment would allow the City to continue the current public matching funds program, but would also provide for the establishment of a public financing program as described.

Additionally, the amendment would now require Council to appropriate at least \$2,000,000 per fiscal year, adjusted for Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles (formerly Los Angeles Riverside Orange County) metropolitan statistical area using 1991 as the base year.

The Committee did not discuss this item.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA and CAO to report back regarding the implications and feasibility of replacing references to "matching public funds" with "public campaign financing," including identification of any unintended legal, fiscal, or policy consequences.

CRC 36 - Special Elections in the Event of a Vacancy

Amends Charter Section 409

Currently, Charter Section 409 states that the Council may fill a vacancy by appointing a person to hold the office for the portion of the unexpired term remaining until the next second Monday in December of an even-numbered year. If a portion of the term remains after that date, the Council shall call a special election to fill the remainder of the term, and consolidate it with the next primary nominating and general municipal election. However, if an appointment to fill a vacancy occurs after the date for filing a Declaration of Intention to become a candidate, the person appointed shall hold the office for the remainder of the unexpired term. Charter Section 409(b) also states that the Council may call a special election to fill a vacancy for the remainder of the unexpired term at the next consolidated election.

The CRC’s proposal includes provisions in Section 409(a) that provide the Council with the option to appoint an individual to fill a vacancy or call a special election when there is less than one year remaining in the term of office. Currently, the Council may choose to fill the vacancy for a portion of the unexpired term, but is only required to call the Special Election after a certain date, as defined by the Charter. It should be noted that the current Charter section does not require the Council to fill a vacancy in City elected offices.

Charter Section 409(a) in its current form has provided flexibility for the Council as to the length of term for an appointee, depending on when the appointment is made. In instances where an incumbent resigned from their office within the first two years of their term, an individual that is appointed prior to the “next second Monday in December of an even-numbered year” could be appointed for a shorter length of time, depending on the timing of the resignation. However, if an appointment is made after the December date referenced above, an appointee could serve in the office for up to two years until the expiration of the term. The CRC’s proposal includes provisions that provide clarity as to when a special election must be called to fill a vacancy in elected offices. Per the CRC’s proposal, if less than one year remains in an unexpired term, the Council may appoint an individual or call a special election to fill a vacancy. If more than one year remains in an unexpired term, the Council would be required to call a special election within 30 days of the vacancy and hold an election within 180 days of the vacancy.

Time Remaining in Unexpired Term	Current Charter Section 409	CRC Proposal
Less than one year	Council may appoint a person to hold office for a portion of the unexpired term. No strict requirement to fill the vacancy.	Council has the option to either appoint an individual to fill the vacancy or call a special election. No explicit requirement to appoint or call a special election.
More than one year	Council may fill by appointment until the next second Monday in December of an even-numbered year. If a portion of the term remains after the above date, a special election shall be called and consolidated with the next primary or general election, for the remainder of the term.	Council is required to call a special election within 30 days and hold it within 180 days of the vacancy.

During its deliberations on this proposal, the Committee engaged in a discussion as to whether the CRC considered potential issues surrounding the timing of special elections in relation to the next primary or general election. The Committee expressed concerns with the inefficiencies associated with calling a special election when a regular primary election is forthcoming. The Committee noted that if a special election is called after a vacancy occurs, and the next regular primary election is expected to occur soon thereafter, consideration should be given as it relates to the special election’s timing and whether it should coincide or be consolidated with the next regular primary election. The Committee asked staff to include provisions that would provide

more flexibility in the Charter in certain special circumstances, as noted in the example above. The CRC's proposal could be revised to note that a special election to fill a vacancy is required if the vacancy occurs more than one year from the date of the primary election immediately preceding the expiration of the term. Incorporating a one year time frame from the date of the primary election would help prevent the City from having to hold successive elections within a short period of time in order to fill a vacancy. For example, a scenario could occur under the CRC's current proposal whereby a special election is held at a time that is directly preceding a regular primary election. This situation could result in significant cost impacts to the City, which would be avoided if a special election was consolidated with a regular primary election.

Furthermore, the City Clerk's office has noted that this CRC proposal could have significant financial impacts as it relates to County election costs. According to the City Clerk, due to the proposal's requirement to hold a special election if more than one year remains in an unexpired term, there may be an increase in the frequency of special elections, as well as an increased likelihood for a standalone special election, which would lead to significant costs for the City. In a communication from the City Clerk, dated May 14, 2026, a special election for a single Council District may cost \$5.2 million (\$5 million for County costs and \$200,000 for candidate filing and petition verification). Additionally, a Citywide election may cost closer to \$30.2 million (\$30 million for County costs and \$200,000 for candidate filing and petition verification).

Recommendation:

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA, with the assistance of the City Clerk and City Attorney, to report on the impacts and costs associated with holding a Special Election within 180 days of a permanent vacancy in an elected office, as well as options for alternative timeframes to call a special election that would provide more flexibility for special circumstances (e.g., one year from the date of the primary election preceding the expiration of the term). This report should include an analysis on whether this 180-day timeframe could impact candidate filing and petition requirements for prospective candidates, as well as potential costs associated with holding a special election that is not consolidated with a regularly scheduled election that is administered by the County of Los Angeles.

CRC 37 – Authorizes the Independent Redistricting Commission to hire separate legal counsel; Includes an annual minimum budget allocation of \$10M for the Independent Redistricting Commission

Amends Charter Section 486 and 488

In this measure, the Commission recommends that the IRC hire outside counsel. Additionally, the Commission recommends revising this section to require that Council and Mayor provide at least \$10 million for IRC operations.

In 2024, voters approved a new Independent Redistricting process for the City, which will be activated in response to the coming 2030 decennial U.S. Census. At that time, the IRC will be able to choose their legal counsel, including outside counsel. They are not required to obtain

approval of their choice for the delivery of legal support. At this time, it is not clear that any revisions are needed for this section.

Additionally, both the CAO and the CLA advise against placing funding obligations in the Charter. The Mayor and Council may make such funding decisions in the budget process. The City often encounters financial challenges that require flexibility in allocating resources. Placing funding commitments in the Charter reduces the ability of the Mayor and Council to be flexible in addressing those financial challenges.

The Committee did not discuss this item. The Committee supported to note and file this recommendation.

Recommendation
Note and file.

CRC 38 – Removes several provisions in Section 803 as it relates to LAUSD and adds these references to the Municipal Code

Amends Charter Section 803

This recommendation, which would amend Charter Section 803, would replace provisions reliant on State law with independent language that restricts campaign financing for candidates for the LAUSD Board of Education.

At present, the election of members of the LAUSD Board of Education is based on and reliant on the California Political Reform Act of 1974, and the language available only serves to supplement the Act.

The proposed Charter amendment would remove the language's reliance on the California Political Reform Act of 1974 and provide replacement language to dictate the terms by which candidates for the LAUSD Board of Education may accept campaign financing. The new language states that candidates shall be subject to the same campaign financing provisions that apply to mayoral candidates. Exceptions are provided for contributions from City lobbyists and bidders, presumably because these apply only to conflicts of interest with City positions, not the LAUSD.

The Committee did not discuss this item.

Recommendation
Present to voters in November 2026.

CRC 54 – Council Authority Over Police Policies

Amends Charter Section 571

The Rules Committee instructed this Office to include this recommendation in the Committee's final recommendations to Council for consideration, and instructed this Office to report on whether Council's ordinance authority should be limited to specific categories.

Under the current City Charter, the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) has primary management authority over the Police Department (LAPD) including the power to issue instructions to the Chief of Police (COP) (Charter Sections 506, 571, and 574). The COP serves as the chief administrative officer of the LAPD (Charter Section 574).

The City Council currently has the following powers that it can employ to influence LAPD policies and actions, but each power is limited as detailed below:

1. Charter Section 240: Legislative Power

Power: The Council has the legislative power to adopt ordinances that require departmental actions.

Limitation: The exact language of the Charter vests the legislative power in the Council “except as otherwise provided in the City Charter.” This language limits the Council’s ability to pass ordinances to direct the LAPD to enact specific policies, since that power is granted in the Charter to the BOPC.

2. Charter Section 245: City Council Veto of Board Actions

Power: This Charter section gives the Council a limited time window to veto BOPC actions by a two-thirds vote.

Limitation: The authority to review and veto actions taken by the BOPC is “veto only.” The Council cannot dictate a preferred action. (Note, however, that CRC 56 proposes to expand the Council’s veto power to include the ability to substitute a preferred action).

3. Charter Section 313: Council Consideration of the Budget

Power: The Council has the power to review the proposed budget submitted by the Mayor. This section gives Council the power to modify the budget by disapproving in whole or in part any item, or by increasing or decreasing any item, or by adding new items by majority vote. This power allows the Council to reduce funding, increase funding, add new programs, delete programs or place limitations on the use of funding for any police program with a majority vote of Council.

Limitation: The Mayor has line-item veto power over changes made to the budget by Council. Council may override the Mayor’s veto by a two-thirds vote.

4. California AB 481: Although this is not part of the Charter, California AB 481 requires the City Council to adopt a policy governing military use of equipment by the police annually by ordinance. This is one specific policy area in which

state law seems to establish that the Council could, if necessary, overrule the BOPC.

In general, Council's Ordinance authority applies to all City Departments. However, these ordinances do not generally govern departmental operations or internal policies, which are set by their respective Commissions overseeing departments. If Council wishes to expand its ordinance authority to establish policies in the Police Department, this Office should be instructed to report on any potential limits that should be adopted.

It should be noted that the powers of the Police Commission are not unique, as under Charter Section 506, "The board of each department under the control and management of a general manager shall have the power to make and enforce all rules and regulations necessary for the exercise of powers and the performance of the duties conferred upon that board by the Charter."

Committee Question: Should Council's authority be limited to specific categories?

Response to Committee Question: Council's current direct authority to set operational policies through ordinance is limited, and more analysis would be required to determine what additional powers, or limits on that additional power, would be appropriate.

Committee Question: What is the History of the Police Commission and Oversight in the LAPD, and what was the impetus behind the creation of the Commission?

Response to Committee Question: In 1925, a new City Charter was adopted, replacing the previous version. Before 1925, the Council appointed the Board of Police Commissioners, who could be removed at any time by the Council. Further, the Department was overseen by Council, with no mayoral oversight or independence for the Police from the legislative branch. This created a system where the Council was frequently involved in police policies and personnel decisions, often at the behest of special interests.

The 1925 Charter sought to address these issues by transferring the power to appoint Commissioners from the Council to the Mayor, with those appointments subject to Council approval, establishing the process for Commission appointments that still exists today. The 1925 Charter also made Commissioners the head of departments, and gave boards the power to appoint and remove department executives, set overall policy and direct agency operations.

In 1992, Charter Amendment F was adopted by the voters, which implemented reform recommendations made by the Christopher Commission, which was convened to investigate the LAPD after the Rodney King beating in 1991. The changes included term limits for the Police Chief; new authority for the Mayor to select the Police Chief, with approval of Council; and enhanced civilian oversight of officer misconduct cases by adding a civilian to the Board of Rights panels. In 1995, voters approved a measure to create the Office of the Inspector General in the LAPD which reports to the Board directly, and in 1998 gave that office further powers to initiate any audit or investigation of the LAPD without prior approval of the Police Commission, as well as guaranteed the IG access to all department information and documents, and the power to issue subpoenas.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the Chief Legislative Analyst, with assistance from the City Attorney, to report on the current limits of Council's authority to set policies via ordinance, and on ways to strengthen or reinforce these powers, including through a potential Charter measure at a later date.

CRC 55 – Liability Insurance for Police Officers

Adds Charter Section 577

The proposed change would require the Police Department (LAPD) to purchase liability insurance of at least \$1 million per officer, provided that it is possible to purchase this insurance at a cost no greater than \$50.00 per month per officer (subject to annual CPI adjustment). Insurance payouts would be used to defray officer liability prior to making payments from the General Fund.

The proposed language does not specify what should happen if coverage costs exceed \$50.00 per month. Based on the public input to the Charter Reform Commission (CRC) that is available for review, it seems that the intention may be that any costs in excess of \$50.00 should be borne by individual police officers; however, this is not explicitly stated in the proposed language. Another possible reading of the proposed language is that the requirement to procure insurance applies only if such insurance is available at \$50 per month or less (and that in other cases, the City will continue to self-insure). The Committee recommended that the LAPD, CAO, CLA and City Attorney be directed to report to the Budget and Finance Committee with an analysis of the proposal.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the LAPD, CAO, CLA and City Attorney to report to the Budget and Finance Committee with an analysis of the proposal to establish a liability insurance program for sworn officers, which could be established by Ordinance. This report should include:

1. A framework and implementation process for requiring every sworn LAPD officer to maintain liability insurance of not less than \$1M;
2. An analysis of available insurance providers and policy structures for providing such insurance;
3. Recommendations for establishing annual cost adjustments based on a CPI index;
4. Any legal or labor implications regarding the City's authority to require insurance coverage as a condition of employment; and
5. A fiscal analysis of the potential impact on the City's General Fund, including projected reductions in liability expenditures and settlements associated with officer misconduct claims.

CRC 56 – Council Veto Over Board of Police Commissioners (via 245)

Amends Charter Section 245

During its discussion of this item, the Committee indicated that it was in support of this recommendation, and instructed the CLA, in coordination with the CAO, to report on the Council’s existing authority under Charter Section 245 and any further ways to enhance it.

This proposed amendment would maintain the Council’s veto power and add to it the power, after a second veto, of acting directly on the matter at hand. Similar to CRC 54, this would be another way to empower the City Council to set or influence policy for the Police Department.

This proposal may result in concerns about improper political influence on the Police Department. These concerns were a major reason for the creation of the Police Commission system in the first place. In addition, allowing Council to substitute its authority to make a decision in place of the Board may inadvertently create a public perception of conflict of interest, or result in other unintentional issues related to the award of contracts or the design of RFPs. This would also create a special Charter Section 245 process applicable only to the Police Commission, leaving other Commissions with broad powers to set policies for their departments untouched.

Committee Question: What is the Council’s existing authority through Charter Section 245, and are there any ways to enhance it?

Response to Committee Question: Charter Section 245 currently provides that the Council can assert jurisdiction over the action of City boards of commissioners, including the BOPC, by a two-thirds vote taken during one of the next five Council meetings (the Charter provides an extended window of ten Council meetings for asserting jurisdiction over a Board action to remove the Chief of Police). After taking jurisdiction, the Council then has 21 days to take action to veto the board action by a 2/3 vote. Any vetoed action is remanded to the Board, which may take the same or different action on the matter, or to take no action. Although the Council can veto, it cannot amend the action or take a substitute action.

More analysis would be required to determine what, if any, actions could be taken to strengthen or enhance the Council’s authority under Charter Section 245 as it relates to the BOPC. Additional research is also needed to determine what changes to Council oversight would result in a more transparent process that enhances oversight of the Department without creating unnecessary hurdles for the Commission or limits on the ability of the Commission to supervise, control and regulate the day-to-day management of the department. It should be noted that research by this Office has not found an instance of the Council exercising its existing authority to veto an action of the BOPC in recent years.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA, with assistance from the City Attorney, to report on the full scope of Council’s existing authority under Charter Section 245, and on any potential ways to enhance these authorities.

CRC 58 – Require the Chief of Police to Protect Constitutional Rights and Strengthening the Chief’s authority to Directly Remove Officers.

Amends Charter Section 574 and 1070

This proposal has two parts. The first part would update the responsibilities outlined in the Charter for the Police Chief to include a requirement that the Chief “shall ensure that the Police Department supports and protects the constitutional rights of all persons, regardless of immigration status, to peacefully assemble and protest, and of duly authorized representatives of any news service, online news service, newspaper, or radio or television station or network to report on such assemblies and protests. Peaceful protest is not the same as violence or rioting; and the Chief shall ensure that the Police Department avoids using violent means to manage peaceful crowds.” The second component would give the Chief the authority to “directly remove officers from employment if those officers have caused, engaged in, are causing harm, or engaging in any misconduct.”

The proposed language on the protections of constitutional rights could be added through an ordinance to amend the Administrative Code. No Charter Amendment is required. It should be noted that all peace officers in the state of California are already obligated to protect an individual’s constitutional rights, and violators can be held to account, as outlined in the Bane Act, (California Civil Code Section 52.1).

A Charter Amendment would be required to amend Charter Section 1070 to authorize the Chief to remove officers from employment. However, the proposed new language does not address an appeals process for these cases. An appeals process is required under the California Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. One potential interpretation is that the Board of Rights process detailed in Charter Section 1070 would still apply, but would take place after the dismissal.

The proposed language is in conflict with the provisions of Charter Section 1070, which state that “No member shall be...removed, or otherwise separated from the service of the department...except...after a full, fair, and impartial hearing before a Board of Rights,” with the exception of temporary relief from duty and/or failure to request a hearing or to appear.

The proposal to give the Chief of Police the power to directly terminate officers is one that was included in the Council’s 2024 Charter Reform proposal (vetoed by the Mayor), in CF #24-1100-S9.

Recommendation

Further study is required.

1. Instruct the Chief Legislative Analyst, with the assistance of the City Attorney to report on the inclusion of a requirement in the Administrative Code that the Chief of Police “shall ensure that the Police Department supports and protects the constitutional rights of all persons, regardless of immigration status, to peacefully assemble and protest, and of duly authorized representatives of any news service, online news service, newspaper, or radio or television station or network to report

on such assemblies and protests. Peaceful protest is not the same as violence or rioting, and the Chief shall ensure that the Police Department avoids using violent means to manage peaceful crowds.”

2. Instruct the Chief Legislative Analyst, Police Department, and City Administrative Officer, with the assistance of the City Attorney to report on proposed changes to Charter Section 1070 that could be proposed to the voters at a later date which would enable the Chief of Police to remove officers from service. This report should include proposals for an appeals process and an overview from the CAO on any need to Meet and Confer with the City’s labor partners on any changes to the disciplinary process.

CRC 59 and CRC 60 - Two-Year Operating Budget
Amends Charter Sections 291, 292, 310 - 313, 315
Adds Charter Sections 316 - 319

The Commission is proposing Charter amendments to establish a two-year (biennial) budget that will function as two, distinct one-year spending plans. The Commission stated that the two-year budget cycle encourages longer term fiscal planning and creates meaningful opportunities for public participation. The Commission’s amendments were consistent with the CAO’s recommendations from their report dated March 13, 2026 (C.F. 23-1027-S3) that provided an analysis and recommendations for the City’s transition to a two-year budget cycle. On March 23, 2026, the Budget and Finance Committee approved the CAO report as amended to change the Proposed Budget release day to April 1st of the year before the biennial budget cycle, instead of April 20th. This change was incorporated into the Commission’s proposal.

As part of the biennial budget, the departments will have a two-year outlook of their respective budgets that will enable them to plan beyond one year and the opportunity to request adjustments during the biennial period as needed. The sequence of the biennial budget development process would be as follows:

- Prior to the beginning of the first year, the Mayor would prepare and propose the first and second year of a two-year budget. The Council would approve the budget for both years, as submitted by the Mayor, or make modifications and return to the Mayor. The current Mayor veto and Council veto override protocols related to the budget would continue to apply.
- Prior to the beginning of the second year of the biennial budget (mid-term), the CAO would complete a performance evaluation process to inform any necessary budget adjustments for the second year of the biennial budget.
- Following the performance evaluation period, the CAO would propose changes to the second-year budget via a Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report, subject to approval of the Council and Mayor. The Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report will replace the traditional budget development process for the second-year and include expenditure and revenue recommendations across all the City funds that

are required to address emerging needs or changes based on the completed performance evaluations. The CAO will also update the Multi-Year Financial Plan after approval of the Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report.

Additionally, the following are other core components of the biennial budget:

- Four-Year Strategic Plan that would be proposed by the Mayor and subject to the approval of the Council that identifies, defines, and prioritizes the City's collective goals for the upcoming four-year period, including, but not necessarily limited to, identifying capital project priorities based on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) ;
- Multi-Year Capital Plan to manage long-term investments in physical infrastructure and technology; and
- Multi-Year Financial Plan will provide the quantitative framework necessary to achieve the financial goals indicated in the Four-Year Strategic Plan that the CAO will prepare on an annual basis and reflect the adopted biennial budget and include estimates of revenues and expenditures in future years.

The Committee supports a biennial budget and instructed our Office to prepare general and enabling Charter language preserving Council flexibility and allowing implementation details to be established and amended through the Los Angeles Administrative Code.

Should the Council wish to proceed with establishing a biennial budget, this Office recommends that the Charter language indicate that the City shall operate on a biennial schedule determined by ordinance or resolution that is adopted by the Council or Mayor. Additionally, this office recommends that the Commission's proposed Charter amendments related to the core components of the biennial budget (i.e., Four-Year Strategic Plan and the Mid-Term Biennial Budget evaluation process and subsequent report) be incorporated by ordinance. This will allow the City to make any necessary adjustments to the development of these crucial components to the biennial budget as the City progresses through the budget development and evaluation processes. Further analysis may be required by the CAO and City Attorney to determine the appropriate Charter amendments needed in order to effectuate a two-year budget.

Recommendations

Present to voters in November 2026.

1. Request the City Attorney to prepare ballot language for the November 2026 ballot to indicate that the City shall operate on a biennial budget cycle encompassing a period of two consecutive fiscal years, unless otherwise stated by ordinance or resolution that is adopted by the Council or Mayor.
2. Instruct the CAO and City Attorney to report if there are other Charter amendments that are necessary to effectuate the two-year budget.
3. Instruct the CAO, CLA, and City Attorney to report on proposed amendments to either the City's Financial Policies or Administrative Code to incorporate the core

components required for the two-year budget (i.e., Four Year Strategic Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report and related evaluation process, etc.).

4. Note and file CRC 60 inasmuch as the Mid-Term Biennial Budget evaluation process and report can be established by ordinance.

CRC 61 – Best Value in Competitive Bid (Proprietary Departments)
Amends Charter Section 371

The Commission report recommends amending Charter Section 371(a) to allow contracts to be let to the bidder providing the best value. Currently, Charter Section 371(a) requires contracts to be let to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder furnishing satisfactory security for performance on the basis of lowest ultimate cost of the items in place and use. Appendix G of the Commission report further specifies that the Commission considers “Best Value” to include equitable hiring decisions, prevailing wage standards, workforce development, local hire goals, apprenticeship training, and project labor agreements.

During its discussion of CRC 61-65, the REIR Committee acknowledged the need for separate analysis of the impacts of potential Charter amendment language related to procurement on proprietary departments (Department of Water and Power, Port of Los Angeles, and Los Angeles World Airports), distinct from General Fund departments. The Charter currently grants contracting power to each of the proprietary departments’ respective boards, with specified parameters for agreements requiring the concurrence of the Council and Mayor.

The proprietary departments support CRC 61-65 related to procurement. The proprietary departments variously describe the existing “lowest bid” requirement as a hindrance to maximizing the value derived from the procurement process. The proprietary departments each stated that the current language forces them to make quality concessions in favor of price, even in cases where the overall value is diminished. Additionally, the Department of Water and Power (DWP) noted security concerns for certain materials and hardware.

The proprietary departments have noted that other municipalities utilize best value as a standard for bidding, with varying implementation methods. One such municipality is San Francisco, which specifies best value procurement as a procurement process for construction services in Section 6.74 of its Administrative Code. That Section allows department heads to contract for public work or improvements estimated to cost \$1.5M or more under specified conditions. The Section states that best value selection criteria may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. Safety record
- B. Past performance
- C. Labor compliance
- D. Demonstrated management competence
- E. Financial condition
- F. Relevant experience

Council will need to consider a variety of factors related to this proposal and conduct its own value assessment. This proposal changes the evaluation criterion for contracts let by the proprietary departments. Despite its shortcomings, the primary benefit of the existing language of “lowest responsive and responsible bidder” is that it refers to well-defined and largely objective quality of proposals that is not subject to change based on the attitudes or abilities of a department’s personnel. This statement, however, admits the corollary that the “lowest bidder” requirement limits a department’s ability to capitalize on identified high-value proposals when those proposals are not of the lowest cost. Further, greater ambiguity in bids may lead to an increase in bid challenges, injecting a different type of bid delay into the process related to grievance response and resolution. Council must weigh the potential risks of moving away from “lowest bid,” a well-defined evaluation criterion for procurement, which is not without its own deficiencies, toward an interpretatively broad “best value” evaluation criterion.

The existing language provides departments with some ability to ensure bids are of a certain quality, by placing stricter standards on what constitutes a responsive and responsible bid. It can be difficult, however, to design a Request for Proposals (RFP) that ensures all responsive and responsive bidders will be of adequate quality, without overspecification, which carries its own set of risks. This approach requires staff to anticipate and account for any possible deficiencies when constructing RFPs, which is understandably more onerous than identifying potential deficiencies after proposals are received and reviewed. Additionally, this may not be practicable in instances where a department’s RFP is without precedent, or if the requirements of the contract being let cannot, by nature, be specified without making quality concessions.

This summary includes information gathered from the proprietary departments, but does not constitute a complete recapitulation of risks with modifying the existing Charter language, or of the benefits of the amended language identified by the proprietary departments. The Charter language under consideration applies to all contracting in the City, not just contracting for the proprietary departments. However, the Charter Reform Commission does not appear to have analyzed these proposals. Further, no analysis has been conducted yet as to whether these changes would be appropriate for all other City departments. If these changes are helpful for all City departments, the changes should apply broadly. If they are not appropriate for all City departments, it is unclear why they would be appropriate for the proprietary departments exclusively. Either way, it is not productive to take Charter revisions to the voters multiple times on the same topic.

If Council wishes to proceed with presenting the matter to voters, the language provided by the CRC is inadequate to safeguard the City from the new risks associated with “best value” procurement, most saliently that it is ill-defined. Language should be included to allow “best value” to be further defined by ordinance, at least illustratively, if not comprehensively.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the City Administrative Officer, in consultation with the Chief Legislative Analyst, the Bureau of Contract Administration, the City Attorney, the proprietary departments, and any contracting departments as necessary, to report on the impacts of amending Charter Section 371(a) to allow contracts to be let to the bidder providing the best value. The report should include consideration of the following

items:the possibility of allowing “best value” evaluation under specified conditions; the extent to which “best value” should be defined, if at all, and whether that definition should be specified in the Charter, through ordinance, or delegated to the contracting department; whether these provisions should be available to all City departments; and potential measures to mitigate risk. If appropriate, the report should include potential amendment language for consideration on the 2028 ballot to effectuate the change to “best value” competitive contracting.

CRC 62: Competitive Sealed Proposals (Proprietary Departments)

Amends Charter Section 371

The Commission report recommends amending Charter Section 371(b) to allow proprietary departments to award contracts using the competitive sealed proposal (CSP) selection process without the need for an ordinance. Currently, Charter Section 371(b) states that “as an alternative to an award pursuant to open and competitive bidding, a contract can be let pursuant to a competitive sealed proposal method, in accordance with criteria established by ordinance adopted by at least a two-thirds vote of the Council.” In order to use the competitive sealed proposal selection process, the contracting authority must make a written finding supported by a written statement of facts that adherence to the rule that the award be made to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder is not practicable or advantageous and shall also state in writing the reason for the particular award.

The CSP selection process is typically used for projects that require alternative delivery methods due to technical details or project complexities that make traditional procurement impractical. Many of the recent construction projects undertaken by the proprietary departments utilize alternative delivery methods necessitating the use of the CSP selection process.

In practice, departments wishing to utilize the CSP selection method must have an ordinance approved for most new contracts using the CSP selection method. Since 2008, Council has approved eight project-specific CSP ordinances for Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA). There is, however, well-established precedent for Council-approved ordinances that authorize the CSP method for multiple projects. For example, a single ordinance authorized LAWA to use the CSP process for various Airport Police Facilities, Administration Buildings, Maintenance Buildings, and Storage Buildings.

The CAO has previously noted that the City’s standard procurement procedures primarily emphasize cost, without considering other essential elements, which can potentially lead to lengthier project delivery times, higher probability of project re-designs, and various change orders. The CSP method is used to obviate these and other issues, however, the turnaround time for CSP ordinance preparation and approval has occasionally contributed to lengthier project timelines.

It is important to note that the CSP ordinance process has historically served as a tool for the Council to “preliminarily check” proposed department projects. If the Council expressed concerns with components of a proposed project, it could reject adoption of the CSP ordinance or work with the proposing department to include modifications in a subsequent ordinance.

This proposal could be effectuated either through ordinance or Charter amendment. The extent to which Council would cede oversight authority by effectuating this change, either through ordinance or Charter amendment, is limited to approval of the ordinance to utilize the CSP method. It should be noted that enacting this proposal through Charter amendment would prevent Council from modifying the policy in the future. By contrast, effectuating this change through a blanket ordinance would allow the Council to modify the policy going forward as appropriate. Such an ordinance could require Council approval of the written findings, currently required in Charter Section 371(b), to justify the use of the CSP selection process.

Regardless of implementation method, the other existing Council oversight opportunities would remain unaffected, including Council review pursuant to Charter Section 373, 606, and/or LAAC Section 10.5. Additionally, Council will retain its ability to assert jurisdiction over actions of the proprietary boards pursuant to Charter Section 245.

Recommendation

This is a policy matter for the City Council to consider. If the Council wishes to provide the proprietary departments with blanket authority to utilize the Competitive Sealed Proposal method for letting contracts, this Office recommends it do so through the adoption of an ordinance, rather than presenting the matter to voters.

CRC 66 – Decennial Charter Review

The Commission recommended that the Charter be amended to add a requirement that a Charter Reform Commission would meet every 10 years to identify and recommend revisions to the Charter (Decennial Commission). They also recommended that the Decennial Commission be empowered to place measures directly on the ballot. The Rules Committee provided instructions on amendments to the Commission's recommendation, specifically that the Decennial Commission begin their work in a year ending in 7 so that their work would be completed prior to the work of the next Independent Redistricting Commission. Since the current Charter Reform Commission has just completed its work, it may not be necessary for a new Decennial Charter Reform Commission to begin work in 2027. Any action on this matter should clarify when the next Decennial Commission would initiate their work.

It may be appropriate to clarify that the purpose of the Decennial Commission is to review the Charter and recommend changes, rather than to reform the Charter every 10 years. Such a distinction may guide focus toward improving City operations, rather than an effort to substantially restructure the City. The Charter should provide stable, dependable governance for the City. Actions by a Decennial Commission could lead to erratic changes in governmental operations, elected representation, and financial controls every ten years if framed as reform rather than review.

Further, checks and balances should be in place to ensure full review and deliberation of changes proposed by the Decennial Commission. The Commission recommends that future Decennial Commissions be authorized to place measures directly on a ballot for voter consideration. This is particularly concerning in that a proposal could obligate the City to services or funding

allocations that could not be sustained. This Commission, for example, made several recommendations that would obligate the City's General Fund to dedicated funding obligations for RAP, Ethics Commission, and the Independent Redistricting Commission that would result in dedicating well over \$300 million in General Fund revenues to dedicated purposes, which would have obligated an equivalent reduction in services in other City departments. As a result, it is recommended that the Commission's proposal be amended to remove the authority for the Commission to place measures directly on the ballot.

Additionally, it should be noted that Chapter 28 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code currently defines the time and manner by which a Charter Reform Commission would be established. The Administrative Code provisions state that a Commission shall be established every ten years, with appointments to the Commission being made in years ending in the number four and the development of proposals to be completed in time for the Council's consideration to submit to the voters in years ending in the number six. The CRC's proposal on this matter directly incorporates the provisions in Chapter 28 of the Administrative Code into a new section of the Charter. When considering this proposal, it may be prudent to weigh whether it is necessary to include detailed provisions related to the time, manner, and organization of the Decennial Commission into the Charter. Incorporating these provisions into the Charter would restrict the City's ability to adapt to the future needs of a Charter review process. For example, as it relates to the composition of the Decennial Commission, if the City wishes to change the composition or the appointment process for the Decennial Commission, the City would need to place a measure before the voters on a future ballot in order to amend these provisions.

Both the CAO and the CLA advise against placing funding obligations in the Charter. The Mayor and Council may make such funding decisions in the budget process. The City often encounters financial challenges that require flexibility in allocating resources. Placing funding commitments in the Charter reduces the ability of the Mayor and Council to be flexible in addressing those financial challenges.

Recommendation

Amend the Los Angeles Administrative Code to further develop the roles and responsibilities of the Decennial Charter Review Commission, including that such Commissions begin their work no later than April 1 in a year ending in 7 beginning in 2037.

CF 26-0489-S3: Motion (Soto-Martinez - Harris-Dawson) to Establish a Regular Schedule of Fee Studies

Motion (Soto-Martinez - Harris-Dawson) requests the City Attorney to prepare the documents necessary for a measure that would amend the Charter to include a requirement that all Charter and ordinance departments that charge fees will be required to institute a regular schedule of fee studies to happen under a defined schedule set by the CAO and to include a line item in each department's budget request for such funding. The Motion further requests the City Attorney to prepare documents necessary to authorize the CAO to:

- direct the order of departmental fee studies,
- set a specific deadline when the City will require complete departmental compliance with the five year schedule,
- recommend adjusted deadlines for compliance from all or single departments for the authorization City Council,
- regularly report on the status of departmental compliance,
- request budgetary support for fee studies, and
- prepare and present to the City Council any model ordinances which further achieve a more complete process for cost recovery, such as an annual automatic adjustment process in non-fee study years.

The City's Financial Policies state that fees for services are levied based on the reasonable cost of providing the service for which they are charged, including the operating, capital, and appropriate projected future costs. The Financial Policies also state that all fees for services should be monitored annually to determine that rates meet, but do not exceed, the reasonable cost of providing the service. If a current or proposed fee is not recovering the reasonable cost of providing the service, the department that administers that service must consider proposing a new fee that is based on the reasonable cost of the service as part of its annual budget submission. For several years, the Adopted Budget has included an instruction to all departments to review their fee structures annually and to report to the Budget and Finance Committee by January 1 of each fiscal year with ordinances, status reports, or negative replies concerning fee adjustments for the following fiscal year.

Despite these policies and annual instructions, fees may not be increased to a level that is adequate enough to achieve full cost recovery. In some instances, the General Fund subsidizes the special funds when the fees do not provide full cost recovery. Along with the release of the Mayor's Proposed Budget each year, the City Administrative Officer releases Proposed Budget Supporting Information which contains a list of proposed fee increases contained in the Proposed Budget as well as a list of fees that are not at full cost recovery.

Property-related fees must comply with the provisions of Proposition 218 and require their own notice and approval requirements. Proposition 218 is a constitutional amendment that restricts the local government's ability to impose taxes, assessments, and property-related fees and requires voter approval for most tax increases.

Any changes to the fee structure would require further analysis by the CLA and CAO to determine revisions, if any, to the Charter, Administrative Code, and/or Financial Policies for those fee increases that can be initiated by Mayor and Council.

Recommendations

1. Note and File the Motion; and
2. Instruct the CAO and CLA to report on the current policies regarding fee increases, the process by which certain fees are recommended for and not recommended for increase during the budget process each year, and options for a regular schedule of fee increases, including:
 - a. a determination of any fees that can include an automatic rate adjustment;
 - b. a process to actively proceed with fee studies in a manner that provides adequate time to conduct a full study with review by Council and the Mayor;
 - c. other factors necessary to effectuate timely completion of required fee studies; and
 - d. instructions and recommendations, including any ordinance if necessary, to effectuate actions to implement timely review of fees and fines.

C.F. 26-0489-S4: Motion (Rodriguez – Blumenfield) relative to expanding the Neighborhood Appeals Commission to seven members and requiring each seat to be represented by appointees from each of the current Area Planning Commissions area.

Motion (Rodriguez – Blumenfield) moves to request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to place on the November 2026 ballot, a measure that would amend the Charter to create a Neighborhoods Appeals Commission (NAC) that is comprised of seven members, and require that each seat be represented by appointees from each of the current seven Area Planning Commissions areas. The seven regions currently represented by the APCs are Central Los Angeles, East Los Angeles, South Los Angeles, West Los Angeles, Harbor, South Valley, and North Valley.

This Motion is contingent upon the passage of CRC 6, which proposes the creation of a five-member NAC to replace the existing APCs. This Motion seeks to expand the membership of the NAC from five, as currently proposed in CRC 6, to seven.

In addition, this Motion seeks to require that each of the proposed seven seats of the NAC be represented by appointees from each of the current APC areas.

No action was taken by the Committee inasmuch as the Motion was continued to a date to be determined. Consistent with this Office's recommendation to note and file CRC 6, which proposes to replace the existing APCs with the new NAC, the recommendation for this Motion is to note and file, inasmuch as the Motion is contingent on the passage of CRC 6.

Recommendation

Note and File.

C.F. 26-0489-S9: Motion (Raman – Blumenfield) relative to establishing the Neighborhood Appeals Commission as the sole appeal body within the City and increasing the Commission to seven members to represent the seven regions of the City.

Motion (Raman – Blumenfield) moves to request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to place on the November 2026 General Election, a measure that would further amend Charter Section 552 to (a) stipulate that the Board of Neighborhood Appeals is the sole appeal body within the City, and will handle appeals of all quasi-judicial matters for first and final consideration regardless of the original decision-maker; and b) increase the board to seven members to represent the seven regions of the City. Note that the Motion’s references to the Board are likely referring to the Neighborhood Appeals Commission proposed by CRC 6. The Motion further moves that this sole appeal body would be appointed by the Mayor and membership would ensure socioeconomic, demographic, geographic, and professional diversity to achieve equitable representation.

The Motion seeks to designate the proposed NAC as the only appellate body within the City (presumably on land use matters) and proposes that the NAC will handle appeals for all quasi-judicial matters for “first and final consideration regardless of the original decision-maker.” The authority proposed to be granted to the NAC by this Motion far exceeds that which is currently proposed under CRC 6, as CRC 6 does not propose the NAC to be the sole appellate body, nor does it deem NAC’s determinations to be final and precluded from further review.

Moreover, the Motion’s proposed “final consideration” language may have the unintended impact of precluding Council from reviewing NAC determinations, thereby raising serious concerns regarding the dilution of Council’s authority to review planning and land use matters, including Council’s authority to assert jurisdiction pursuant to Charter 245(e). In addition, if the NAC is the sole appellate body on planning and land use matters, then appellate authority will be stripped from the City Planning Commission and possibly other bodies such as the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners.

Second, the Motion moves to increase the Commission to seven members to represent the seven regions of the City, and further states that this body would be appointed by the Mayor and membership would ensure socioeconomic, demographic, geographic, and professional diversity to achieve equitable representation. It can be inferred that the seven regions referenced in the Motion are referring to the existing seven respective regions represented by each APC, as follows: Central Los Angeles, East Los Angeles, South Los Angeles, West Los Angeles, Harbor, South Valley, and North Valley. The Motion also includes in the moving clause language to ensure socioeconomic, demographic, geographic, and professional diversity to achieve equitable representation. To ensure that this policy objective is implemented, it follows that this should be a qualification or requirement to be appointed to the NAC.

Finally, this Motion only states that NAC members would be appointed by the Mayor, and is silent on whether Council’s confirmation is necessary to complete the appointment. CRC 6 relative to amending Charter Section 552 proposes that members of the NAC are to be appointed and removed in the same manner as members of the City Planning Commission (CPC). The

current Charter is silent on the appointment process for CPC Commissioners. However, current practice has been that CPC Commissioners are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by Council.

No action was taken by the Committee inasmuch as the Motion was continued to a date to be determined. Consistent with this Office's recommendation to note and file CRC 6, which proposes to replace the existing APCs with the new NAC, the recommendation for this Motion is to note and file, inasmuch as the Motion is contingent on the passage of CRC 6 and further clarification is needed as to the intent of the Motion.

Recommendation

Note and File.

C.F. 26-0638: Motion (Soto-Martinez – Jurado) relative to a ballot measure to enable the City Council to authorize noncitizen voting in elections for City offices and for members of the Los Angeles Board of Education.

Motion (Soto-Martinez - Jurado) would request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to place on the November 2026 ballot a measure that would amend the Charter to grant Council the ability to introduce an ordinance that would authorize noncitizens to vote in elections for City offices and for members of the Board of Education. Regarding non-citizen voting, the Committee asked what provision of our Charter presently requires that City voters must be registered voters. That requirement is in Section 408(a), which requires voters be registered and qualified as required by the general laws of the State.

Relevant State law provisions are Cal. Constitution Article II Section 2 and State Elections Code Section 2000, which state that an individual must be a U.S. citizen who is 18 years old or older and is eligible to vote.

As a result, Section 408 of the Charter would need to be changed.

Other places that reference voting by registered voters include:

- Section 104(c) regarding restrictions on the sale of public utilities
- Sections 430, 435, 438(b) regarding recalls
- Section 451 regarding initiative petitions
- Section 460 regarding referendary measures
- Sections 651(b), 673(b), 677(a)(2)(C) regarding various votes concerning proprietary departments

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA and City Clerk, with the assistance of the City Attorney, to report on the feasibility of authorizing noncitizen voting in elections for City offices and for members of the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education. This report should indicate recommendations for changes to Charter provisions that could allow for noncitizen voting should State and/or Federal election laws change.

C.F. 26-0654 – Motion (Raman – Blumenfield) to Assign Responsibility for Certain Facilities Not in the Public Right-of-Way to the Department of Public Works

Motion (Raman – Blumenfield) requests the City Attorney to prepare a measure to amend the Charter to expand the powers and duties of the Department of Public Works to include the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities that are not in the public right-of-way, but under which the City has an agreement to do so.

Currently Charter Section 580(a) assigns the Department of Public Works with the responsibility to “design, construct, excavate and maintain streets and public works improvements including but not limited to bridges, public parkways and rights-of-way, sanitary sewers and storm drains, water and sewer treatment facilities, landfills and public rights-of-way lighting facilities owned by the City.”

A draft ordinance was approved by the Transportation Committee and is currently pending before the Public Works Committee that would assign responsibility for maintenance of all bicycle and multi-use paths, including those on private property under which the City has a responsibility or agreement to maintain, to the Department of Public Works (C.F. 25-0481).

It is unlikely that the full cost for the City’s various maintenance and operation agreements, for facilities off of the public right-of-way, are fully funded. As such, if responsibility for these agreements is centralized in the Department of Public Works, the Department would likely require additional resources to conduct the work. Additionally, the proprietary departments may have agreements that include maintenance and operation responsibilities on property out of the public right-of-way. Should this Charter amendment be approved, it is unclear if the Department of Public Works would be obligated to assume maintenance responsibility for these agreements as well.

No action was recommended by the Committee. Given that this policy is already partially being established via ordinance under C.F. 25-0481 and could be fully enacted through ordinance without any necessary revisions to the Charter, this Office is recommending that the Motion be noted and filed.

Recommendation
Note and file.

C.F. 26-0656 – Motion (McOsker – Blumenfield) to Remove the Full-Time Employment Requirement for Board of Public Works Members

Motion (McOsker – Blumenfield) requests the City Attorney, with assistance of the Chief Legislative Analyst, to prepare a measure to amend the Charter to remove the full-time employment requirement for Board of Public Works members.

Currently, Charter Section 581 requires that members of the Board of Public Works “devote their entire time to the duties of the office.” The proposed Charter amendment would eliminate this full-time employment requirement.

As part of the 2025-26 budget hearings, the Budget and Finance Committee discussed converting the Board of Public Works to a voluntary commission. The CAO reported that the Charter requirement for Board members to serve full-time was a significant barrier to converting the Board from a paid commission to a voluntary commission.

No action was recommended by the Committee. Given that this amendment would be impacted by discussions over the Department of Public Works' general governance and structure as detailed under CRC 1, this Office recommends that consideration of the Board's full-time status be a part of the Council's further study of the makeup of the Department of Public Works. If CRC 1 is noted and filed this Motion could be considered a standalone proposal.

Recommendation

Further study is required. Instruct the CLA, with the assistance of the CAO and City Attorney, to report on the general structure and governance of the Department of Public Works, including options to remove the full-time requirement for Board of Public Works members.

CF 26-0659: Board of Airport Commissioners Residency Requirements

This item is a Motion (Park, Padilla – McOsker) contemplating an amendment to Section 630 of the Charter to require that at least three members of the Board of Airport Commissioners shall reside within the area surrounding Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and that at least two members of the Board of Airport Commissioners (BOAC) shall reside within the area surrounding Van Nuys Airport (VNY), as these areas are defined by ordinance, and to authorize the City Council by ordinance to further define subareas within such areas and establish Commissioner residency distribution requirements among those subareas.

Charter Section 630 currently requires that at least one member of BOAC shall reside within the area surrounding LAX and at least one member shall reside within the area surrounding VNY, as those areas are defined by ordinance. Charter Section 630 also provides that BOAC is a seven member board.

If Council wishes to proceed with presenting this matter to the electorate, it is important to consider whether the total membership of BOAC should be increased to accommodate the increased residency requirements. The Board of Harbor Commissioners has residency requirements for two of its five seats (40 percent). Approval of this proposal would place a residency requirement on five of BOAC's seven seats (71 percent). If this matter is approved with no increase to total membership, multiple members currently serving on BOAC would need to be replaced to comply with the new residency requirement.

Committee Question: Instruct the CLA, in conjunction with the City Attorney to report back with the appropriate language to consider this item outside of the City Charter and in City ordinance.

Response to Committee Question: The intent of the Motion cannot be effectuated through ordinance to amend the LAAC. Charter Section 630 merely affords the opportunity for updating the definitions of “area surrounding Los Angeles International Airport” and “area surrounding Van Nuys Airport” through ordinance, not increasing residency requirements, board membership totals, or distribution among subareas.

Recommendation

This is a policy matter for the City Council to consider.

Personnel Department Charter Proposals

The Committee heard testimony from the Personnel Department concerning four proposals to amend the Charter. At this time, the Department is continuing discussions with labor concerning those proposals in a meet-and-confer process. Further, the EERC is expected to consider these proposals as well. No action is recommended on these at this time as they remain under consideration and the meet-and-confer process is ongoing.

Recommendation

Further study is required.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

During the course of deliberations in the Rules Committee, members requested reports on issues that were not presented by the Commission, Council Motion, or Departmental Correspondence as Charter amendments. These were, however, matters concerning governance controlled by the Charter. The following section addresses these questions.

AUDITS OF PROGRAMS IN ELECTED OFFICES

The Commission made one recommendation with regard to the City Controller (Controller). In his remarks to the Committee, the City Controller identified several other actions that could be presented to the voters. The Rules Committee has not yet included any other actions for consideration related to the Controller.

During deliberations, the Committee requested analysis of issues associated with the conduct of performance audits of programs that are operated within elected offices. This review provides basic information concerning audit authorities generally and constraints that have been identified in the Controller’s ability to conduct performance audits.

In a related matter, a Commission recommendation related to the Ethics Commission concerns the establishment of an Ethics Commission Inspector General (CRC 26) who would be able to conduct performance audits of elected officials and their offices.

Committee Question: How can performance audits be conducted on programs that are administered by elected officials? This report should include the types of performance audits that can and cannot be performed by the Controller, with consideration of the

distinction between fraud, waste and abuse audits, financial audits, and performance audits.

Response to Committee Question: While there are a wide range of audit types that are noted in a general information search, the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) prepared by the U.S. Government Accountability Office identify two types of audits: financial and performance. The Charter currently designates the City Controller as the auditor of the City. Among the powers assigned to the office are responsibility to conduct financial audits of Departments and elected offices and performance audits of Departments. The Charter specifically notes that audits will be conducted in a manner consistent with GAGAS.

There have been on-going discussions in various venues, including the Courts, as to whether the Controller can conduct performance audits of elected offices. The Courts have concluded that the Charter does not allow such audits: financial audits are allowed, but not performance audits. As a result, discussions have focused on options to allow for performance audits of programs operated within elected offices.

Option to Allow for Program Audits in Elected Offices

It would be an option for the Charter to be amended to revise Section 261(k) to allow performance audits of “departments and offices” as the means to allow for performance audits of elected offices. Section 261 of the Charter outlines the duties of the Controller. Section 261(k) specifically states that the Controller shall:

“conduct performance audits of all departments and may conduct performance audits of City programs ...”

This is different from the language that authorizes the Controller to conduct financial audits under Section 261(e), which states that the Controller shall:

“In compliance with generally accepted government auditing standards, audit all *departments and offices* of the City, including proprietary departments, where any City funds are either received or expended...”

As noted in italics, the authority to conduct financial audits identifies “departments and offices,” which is different from the language to conduct performance audits which calls out “departments” exclusively. The later language would be amended.

Options That Do Not Require a Charter Amendment

There are several means to ensure that City programs operated within an elected office are eligible for performance audits by the Controller.

The primary method is to place services and programs into operational departments. The conflict associated with the ability to conduct a program audit is associated only with those programs that are operated by the Mayor, City Attorney, or Councilmembers. When establishing new programs, Council could ensure that those programs are assigned to an operational department.

This would avoid any issues associated with conducting a program audit, as the Controller has authority to conduct performance audits of services and programs located in departments.

If a service or program is placed within an elected office, that elected official could choose to allow a program audit of the service or program. Nothing prevents the elected official from voluntarily agreeing to allow a performance audit of a program under their control.

Finally, the Council could choose to withhold funding for a program operated within another elected official's office until a program audit is implemented or completed. The Council has authority to manage the City's funds in such a manner. Placing funds for a service or program that is operated by an elected office into the Unappropriated Balance pending the initiation or completion of a program audit could serve as incentive to activate an audit or preemptively to achieve voluntary agreement by an elected official to allow a program audit to be conducted.

Ethics Inspector General

The Charter Reform Commission included a recommendation to establish an Ethics Commission Inspector General (EC IG) that would have unlimited authority to audit any elected official or department. The EC IG as proposed would be first among inspectors general in the City and would have wide ranging authority. The EC IG would be selected by the Executive Director of the Ethics Commission, subject to a three-fourths vote of the Commission, and report to and serve at the will of the Ethics Commission. The Ethics Commission may refer matters to the EC IG on a majority vote; the City Council may refer matters to the EC IG on a two-thirds vote of the Council.

Due to the unlimited nature of the EC IG's authority, performance audits of elected offices would be allowable.

Attachment A

Recommendation #	Department	Description	Charter Section
CRC 1	Public Works	Empowers the Director of Public Works to manage the day-to-day operations of the Department of Public Works and all of its bureaus; supports the function of citywide capital improvement planning; excludes the Director of Public Works from Transfer of Powers provisions	Sections 514, 581, 582
CRC 2	Public Works	Establishes a Capital Improvement Program with the Department of Public Works being the lead agency; Capital Improvement Program Plan shall span a minimum of five fiscal years and shall have identified and dedicated funding sources	Section 323 (NEW)
CRC 3	Public Works	Dedicate a minimum of 2 percent of the City's budget to the Department of Public Works	Section 583 (NEW)
CRC 4	Recreation and Parks	Increase the Department of Recreation and Parks Charter-mandated minimum for the Department's budget to 0.065% of assessed property value	Section 593
CRC 5	Recreation and Parks	Allows the Department to sell or transfer land that is not suitable for or determined to be a viable use for public recreation or open space; Approval of the sale or transfer can be done via the Board of Recreation and Park's determination, with the approval of the Council, OR by the Council through the adoption of a Motion.	Section 594
CRC 6	Planning	Replace the City's five Area Planning Commissions with a new Neighborhood Appeals Commission consisting of five members; allow Neighborhood Appeals Commission to consider issues de novo in appeals	Section 552
CRC 7	Planning	Create a time limit for when the Council remands an item to the City Planning Commission or Neighborhood Appeals Commission; Commissions shall have 30 days to concur or dissent with Council and the matter shall be referred to Council for a final vote; Upon re-referral from the Commissions, the Council must act within 21 days or the action of the Commissions is final	Section 245(e)
CRC 8	Planning	Creates a 75-day time limit for the Council to act on a General Plan Amendment that has received approval from the City Planning Commission and the Mayor that deems the amendment approved if not acted upon.	Section 555(e)
CRC 9	Planning	Allows the Council to amend the floor area restriction (FAR) limit to exceed 13:1 via ordinance	Section 104(e)
CRC 10	Planning	Empowers the Department of City Planning by allowing for the review and approval, conditional approval, or denial of quasi-judicial applications, as prescribed by ordinance.	Section 561; Deletes Sections 562-565
CRC 11	Misc.	Removes the Business Enterprises section of the Charter	Section 104(g)
CRC 12	Council	Expand the City Council to 25 single-member district, which shall be effective in 2032 upon the adoption of the final redistricting plan	Sections 241 and 487
CRC 13	CAO	Redesignates the City Administrative Officer as the Chief Financial Officer, with a ten-year term; defines roles in the development and adoption of Capital Improvement Program, preparation of a mid-term biennial budget report and a multi-year financial plan	Sections 290-293
CRC 14	City Attorney	Bifurcates the office of the City Attorney into a City Attorney and a City Prosecutor	Sections 270-275
CRC 15	Controller	Incorporates Controller's fraud, waste, and abuse duties into the Controller's powers and duties	Section 261

Recommendation #	Department	Description	Charter Section
CRC 16	Mayor	Includes clause that indicates that Council's authority to create departments, offices and boards does not limit the Mayor's power described in Section 514 (Transfer of Powers; New amendments)	Section 214
CRC 17	Mayor	Allows the Mayor to introduce Motions to propose an action of the Council during Council meetings; and allows Mayor to attend closed sessions, participate in discussions, but not vote	Section 231
CRC 18	Mayor	Increases Mayor's time limit for temporary transfer of employees to 365 days	Section 233
CRC 19	Mayor	Allows the Mayor, by proclamation, to call a Special Meeting of the Council	Section 242
CRC 20	Mayor	Increases the Mayor's authority to transfer funds without Council approval when funds are not in excess of \$271,460 or 4 percent of the budget of the account receiving the transfer, whichever is greater, but not to exceed \$400K; subjects the monetary limitations to annual adjustments based on CPI	Section 342
CRC 21	Mayor	Allows the Mayor to transfer powers, duties and functions of departments, offices and boards to another department, office or board; Mayor may also direct any department, office or board to perform the powers, duties, and functions of another department; Transfers shall be effectuated by Executive Directive; No Council approval or consideration required	Section 514
CRC 22	Clerk; Elections	Creates a Ranked Choice Voting system that replaces the current electoral runoff system; effective in 2032	Section 428 (NEW)
CRC 23	Clerk; Elections	Lowers the voting age to 16 and allows these individuals to vote in elections for City offices and members of the Board of Education	Section 408
CRC 24	Clerk; Elections	Changes ballot access requirements by extending filing deadlines/collection timeframes; lowers the signature threshold for nominating petitions to 350 registered voters (previously 500)	Section 421-422
CRC 25	Clerk	Extends the appointment window of commissioners from 45 days to 60 days when a vacancy occurs on a commission/board; prohibits appointing authority from requiring prospective appointees to sign a letter of resignation	Section 502
CRC 26	Ethics Commission	Creates an Inspector General position for the Ethics Commission that has the power to audit and investigate City officials and departments	Section 713 (NEW)
CRC 27	Ethics Commission	Prohibits a member of the Ethics Commission and the Executive Director from running for City office of LAUSD Board office for at least five years following the expiration of the term of office	Section 700
CRC 28	Ethics Commission	Authorizes the Ethics Commission to retain its own general counsel, attorneys, and legal support staff that is independent from the City Attorney	Section 708
CRC 29	Ethics Commission	Increases the Ethics Commission's annual minimum appropriation to \$10 million	Section 711
CRC 30	Ethics	Allows the Council to suspend any elected officer by a three-fourths vote if charges have been filed and the officer is undergoing felony criminal proceedings, or criminal misdemeanor proceedings related to a violation of official duties; A member of the Council must introduce a Resolution with stated findings of misconduct and shall be heard and voted upon within seven calendar days of its introduction; No changes to compensation shall be made and the suspension will end if the officer is acquitted	Section 211

Recommendation #	Department	Description	Charter Section
CRC 31	Ethics	If a Councilmember is suspended, the Council may appoint a person as a non-voting manager of the office of the suspended member; a Motion needs to be introduced and heard within seven calendar days regarding the appointment	Section 211.1 (NEW)
CRC 32	Ethics	Increases the monetary penalty for an Ethics violation to the greater of \$15,000 for each violation or three times the amount for which the person improperly reported or contributed; adjusts the maximum penalty according to CPI; prohibits the use of campaign funds to pay for violations	Section 706
CRC 33	Ethics	Authorizes the Ethics Commission to submit ballot measures within their subject matter jurisdiction directly to the voters at the next scheduled City election; any ballot measure shall be presented to the Council which shall hold a public hearing and propose amendments, but shall not directly block Ethics Commission's authority to place measures on the ballot	Section 703
CRC 34	Ethics	Aligns the City's contribution limits with LAUSD adjusted timelines	Section 470
CRC 35	Ethics	Removes language referencing matching public funds and adds language that discusses public campaign funding in order to more broadly permit additional public financing models	Section 471
CRC 36	City Clerk; Elections	Requires that a special election be called when a vacancy in City offices occur and the vacancy occurs more than one year before the expiration of the term of office; Special election must be held within 180 days of the vacancy	Section 409
CRC 37	Redistricting	Authorizes the Independent Redistricting Commission to hire separate legal counsel; Includes an annual minimum budget allocation of \$10M for the Independent Redistricting Commission	Sect. 486 amd 488
CRC 38	LAUSD	Removes several provisions in Section 803 as its relates to LAUSD and adds these references to the Municipal Code	Section 803
CRC 39	Misc.	Includes language throughout the Charter that strengthens language access requirements to ensure that the City adopts and maintains policies that are accessible to the languages spoken by its residents	Various
CRC 40	Public Bank	Includes language that references Public Banking provisions, as outlined similarly in State Law	Section 363 (NEW)
CRC 41	Neighborhood Councils	Expands on Neighborhood Councils (NCs) authority by outlining their ability to conduct community outreach via stakeholder engagement, and collaboration with City departments, elected officials, and other NCs	Section 908
CRC 42	Neighborhood Councils	Requires that NCs are allowed to provide public comment via telephone or online teleconferencing at all meetings of the Council and its Committees; Requires that NCs be placed in a separate queue for public comment if a Community Impact Statement has been submitted; extends these provisions to City Boards and Commissions	Section 242; and Section 515 (NEW)
CRC 43	Neighborhood Councils	Expands the Board of Neighborhood Councils from seven to nine commissioners; the two additional commissioners shall be appointed by interested individuals who obtain the approval of a majority of all Neighborhood Councils; authorizes the Board to approve contracts and leases prepared on behalf of NCs or the NC system; requires that all board members complete legally-required training before voting at meetings	Section 902
CRC 44	Neighborhood Councils	Allows NCs to submit statements with respect to legislation proposed to or pending before a governmental agency	Section 254
CRC 45	Neighborhood Councils	Allows NCs via the Chair of the Board of Neighborhood Councils, or another designated Commissioner, to submit to the Mayor their budget requests for the next fiscal year	Section 311

Recommendation #	Department	Description	Charter Section
CRC 46	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Allows NCs to submit questions (via a majority vote) to Mayor questions that could be asked during the interview process for the General Manager of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment	Section 903
CRC 47	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Updates the title of Section 905 to "Initial Implementation of the Plan"	Section 905
CRC 48	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Changes the title of Section 907 "Early Warning System" to "Advance Notice and Opportunities for Input"	Section 907
CRC 49	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Capitalizes "Neighborhood Council" throughout the Charter	Various Sections
CRC 50	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Replaces the word "Citizen" with "Civic" participation throughout Article IX (Neighborhood Councils in Article IX	Various Sections
CRC 51	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Replaces the word "officers" with Board Members in Department of Neighborhood Empowerment Charter provisions	Section 901
CRC 52	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Updates the title of Section 904 to "Development and Maintenance of the Neighborhood Council Plan	Section 904
CRC 53	Neighborhood Councils; Misc.	Updates certification and bylaws requirements for NCs by removing provision stating that NC membership is open to "everyone who lives; works or owns property in the area"; indicates that "stakeholders" will be further defined by ordinance	Section 906
CRC 54	Police Department	Includes a provision that states that the authority of the Board of Police Commissioners to issue instructions to the Chief of Police shall not supersede the authority of the Council to adopt ordinances governing the policies of the Chief and the Police Department; Notes that any ordinances adopted by the Council shall supersede the Board of Police Commissioners' authority	Section 571
CRC 55	Police Department	Requires the Police Department to purchase liability insurance for each police officers; Coverage cannot be less than \$1M and cost of insurance should not exceed \$50 per month; Cost of insurance shall be adjusted by CPI; Indicates that if an officer is found liable, any payments to the opposing party shall be paid out using the insurance payout first before paying from the General Fund	Section 577 (NEW)
CRC 56	Police Department	Includes a new section in Charter Section 245 that allows the Council veto actions of the Board of Police Commissioners; Vetos will be sent back to the Board of Police Commissioners for their consideration, and may concur with the Council, override the Council's veto, or modify the Board's original action; If the Board overrides the Council's action, the action shall be transmitted to the Council and the Council shall have the same authority to act on a matter as that originally held by the Board	Section 245 (f) (NEW)
CRC 57	Police Department	Includes a provision in Section 1070 (Rights and Due Process Procedures) that allows the Council to consider a personnel determination made by the Police Board of Rights and have the ability to veto and remand the matter back to the Board of Rights for reconsideration; the Board of Rights shall have 30 days to reconsider the action and determine whether to override the Council; if the Council action is overridden, the Council shall consider the override and shall have the same authority to act on the matter as that originally held by the Board of Rights	Section 1070 (g) (NEW)
CRC 58	Police Department	Includes language that requires the Chief of Police to ensure that the Police Departments supports and protects the constitutional rights of all persons, specifically their rights to assemble and protest; includes a provision that states that the Chief of Police can directly remove officers if they have engaged in misconduct	Section 574

Recommendation #	Department	Description	Charter Section
CRC 59	CAO	Authorizes the creation of a two-year operating budget consisting of two consecutive fiscal years that includes the following associated provisions: creation of a Four-Year Strategic Plan that identifies the City's goals and priorities; shifts the departmental timeline for budget estimates to December 1 instead of January 1; shifts the timeline for the Mayor's submittal of a proposed biennial budget to April 1st instead of April 20th; requires public comment for the proposed biennial budget to occur over at least three separate dates during the Budget Committee's consideration (first day of hearings, final day of hearings, and another of the Committee's choosing) and at least once during the Council's consideration	Section 291 and 292; Section 310 to 315
CRC 60	CAO	Requires departmental performance evaluations with potential proposed adjustments to Departments for the second year of the biennial cycle; requires the CAO to develop a Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report that provides updated expenditures and revenue projections; Requires Council and Mayoral approval of report	Section 316 to Section 319 (NEW)
CRC 61	Contracting/Procurement	Replaces language for the letting of contracts from "lowest responsive and responsible bidder" with "best value" language for competitive bidding and competitive sealed proposals	Section 371
CRC 62	Contracting/Procurement	Removes the ordinance requirement for the letting of contracts pursuant to competitive sealed proposals	Section 371(b)
CRC 63	Contracting/Procurement	Allows exceptions to lowest bid requirements for critical infrastructure and software	Section 371(e)
CRC 64	Contracting/Procurement	Allows contracting authority to cure technical/administrative defects as it relates to violations of campaign contribution related disclosures;	Section 470
CRC 65	Proprietary Leases	Allows the Department of Airports, Harbor Department, and Department of Water and Power are authorized to enter into 66 year leases, subject to the approval of the Council	Section 607
CRC 66	Misc.	Requires periodic review of the City Charter every ten years through the creation of a Charter Reform Commission consisting of 13 members, and gives the Commission the authority to submit Charter amendments directly to the voters without Mayor and/or Council approval	Section 491 to 494 (NEW)

ATTACHMENT B

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments			
Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
<i>Charter Reform Commission Recommendations</i>			
CRC 1	Empowers the Director of Public Works to manage the day-to-day operations of the Department of Public Works and all of its bureaus; supports the function of Citywide capital improvement planning; excludes the Director of Public Works from Transfer of Powers provisions	American Institute of Architects Los Angeles; Streets for All; Board of Public Works (if amended)	Board of Public Works (as written)
CRC 2	Establishes a Capital Improvement Program with the Department of Public Works being the lead agency; Capital Improvement Program Plan shall span a minimum of five fiscal years and shall have identified and dedicated funding sources	American Institute of Architects Los Angeles	
CRC 3	Dedicate a minimum of 2 percent of the City's budget to the Department of Public Works	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; American Institute of Architects Los Angeles	
CRC 4	Increase the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) Charter-mandated minimum for the Department's budget to 0.065% of assessed property value	Los Feliz Neighborhood Council; Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Venice Neighborhood Council; Central Hollywood Neighborhood Council; American Institute of Architects Los Angeles; Save Elephant Hill; Tias on Trails San Fernando Valley Audubon Society; Griffith Park Advisory Board; Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley; Streets for	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
		All; Chatsworth Neighborhood Council; Department of Recreation and Parks Board of Commissioners	
CRC 5	Allows RAP to sell or transfer land that is not suitable for or determined to be a viable use for public recreation or open space; Approval of the sale or transfer can be done via the Board of Recreation and Park's determination, with the approval of the Council, OR by the Council through the adoption of a Motion.	Department of Recreation and Parks Board of Commissioners (if amended)	Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council; Greater Valley Glen Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; Community Forest Advisory Committee; California State Lands Commission; Department of Recreation and Parks Board of Commissioners (as written)
CRC 6	Replaces the City's seven Area Planning Commissions with a new Neighborhood Appeals Commission (NAC) consisting of five members; allows the NAC to consider issues <i>de novo</i> in appeals; and amends authority to grant NAC the power to hear appeals of quasi-judicial determinations.	Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council	Westside Neighborhood Council
CRC 7	Creates a 30-day time limit for the City Planning Commission or Neighborhood Appeals Commission to concur with or dissent from Council upon remand and after Council asserts jurisdiction;		Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	Commission’s action on remand shall be referred to Council for a final vote; and upon re-referral from the Commission, the Council must act within 21 days or the action of the Commission becomes final.		
CRC 8	Creates a 75-day time limit for the Council to act on a General Plan Amendment (GPA) that has received approval from the City Planning Commission and the Mayor; and deems the GPA approved if not acted upon instead of deemed denied.		
CRC 9	Allows the Council to amend the floor area restriction (FAR) limit to exceed 13:1 via ordinance.		
CRC 10	Grants the Planning Department the authority to investigate, hear, and determine all applications for quasi-judicial review; grants the Planning Director the authority to appoint staff to perform the duties of quasi-judicial review; and deletes in their entirety existing Charter Sections related to variances, conditional use permits and other similar quasi-judicial approvals, projects requiring multiple approvals; and the City Planning Commission’s		

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	authority to delegate legislative authority to the Area Planning Commissions.		
CRC 11	Removes the Business Enterprises section of the Charter		
CRC 12	Expand the City Council to 25 single-member districts, which shall be effective in 2032 upon the adoption of the final redistricting plan	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause; Center for Asian Americans United for Self Empowerment; Los Angeles Improvement Association; San Fernando Valley Young Democrats; Asian American Pacific Islander Equity Alliance	Westside Neighborhood Council
CRC 13	Redesignates the City Administrative Officer as the Chief Financial Officer, with a ten-year term; defines roles in the development and adoption of Capital Improvement Program, preparation of a mid-term biennial budget report and a multi-year financial plan		
CRC 14	Bifurcates the office of the City Attorney into a City Attorney and a City Prosecutor	Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Improvement Association	Westside Neighborhood Council; Office of the City Attorney; Former City Attorney Mike Feuer; Los Angeles City Attorneys Association
CRC 15	Incorporate Controller’s fraud, waste, and abuse duties into	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	the Controller’s powers and duties	Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; Neighborhood Council Budget Advocates; Office of the City Controller	
CRC 16	Includes clause that indicates that Council's authority to create departments, offices and boards does not limit the Mayor's power described in Section 514 (Transfer of Powers; New amendments)		Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
CRC 17	Allows the Mayor to introduce Motions to propose an action of the Council during Council meetings; and allows Mayor to attend closed sessions, participate in discussions, but not vote		Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
CRC 18	Increases Mayor's time limit for temporary transfer of employees to 365 days		Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
CRC 19	Allows the Mayor, by proclamation, to call a Special Meeting of the Council		Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
CRC 20	Increases the Mayor's authority to transfer funds without Council approval when funds are not in excess of \$271,460 or 4 percent of the budget of the account receiving the transfer, whichever is greater, but not to exceed \$400K; subjects the monetary limitations to annual adjustments based on CPI		Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
CRC 21	Allows the Mayor to transfer		Bel Air Beverly Crest

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	powers, duties and functions of departments, offices and boards to another department, office or board; Mayor may also direct any department, office or board to perform the powers, duties, and functions of another department; Transfers shall be effectuated by Executive Directive; No Council approval or consideration required		Neighborhood Council
CRC 22	Creates a Ranked Choice Voting system that replaces the current electoral runoff system; effective in 2032	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley; San Fernando Valley Young Democrats	Westside Neighborhood Council
CRC 23	Lowers the voting age to 16 and allows these individuals to vote in elections for City offices and members of the Board of Education	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Unified School District	Westside Neighborhood Council
CRC 24	Changes ballot access requirements by extending filing deadlines/collection timeframes; lowers the signature threshold for nominating petitions to 350 registered voters (previously 500)	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	Westside Neighborhood Council
CRC 25	Extends the appointment window of commissioners from 45 days to 60 days when a vacancy occurs on a commission/board; prohibits appointing authority from requiring prospective appointees to sign a letter of	California Common Cause	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	resignation		
CRC 26	Create an Inspector General position for the Ethics Commission that has the power to audit and investigate City officials and departments	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles Police Commission
CRC 27	Prohibits a member of the Ethics Commission and the Executive Director from running for City office of LAUSD Board office for at least five years following the expiration of the term of office	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council	
CRC 28	Authorizes the Ethics Commission to retain its own general counsel, attorneys, and legal support staff that is independent from the City Attorney	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	
CRC 29	Increases the Ethics Commission's annual minimum appropriation to \$10 million	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	
CRC 30	Allows the Council to suspend any elected officer by a three-fourths vote if charges have been filed and the officer is undergoing felony criminal proceedings, or criminal misdemeanor proceedings related to a violation of official duties; A member of the Council must introduce a Resolution with stated findings of misconduct and shall be heard and voted upon	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	within seven calendar days of its introduction; No changes to compensation shall be made and the suspension will end if the officer is acquitted		
CRC 31	If a Councilmember is suspended, the Council may appoint a person as a non-voting manager of the office of the suspended member; a Motion needs to be introduced and heard within seven calendar days regarding the appointment	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	
CRC 32	Increases the monetary penalty for an Ethics violation to the greater of \$15,000 for each violation or three times the amount for which the person improperly reported or contributed; adjusts the maximum penalty according to CPI; prohibits the use of campaign funds to pay for violations	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	
CRC 33	Authorizes the Ethics Commission to submit ballot measures within their subject matter jurisdiction directly to the voters at the next scheduled City election; any ballot measure shall be presented to the Council which shall can hold a public hearing and propose amendments, but shall not directly block Ethics Commission's authority to	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	place measures on the ballot		
CRC 34	Aligns the City's contribution limits with LAUSD adjusted timelines	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	
CRC 35	Removes language referencing matching public funds and adds language that discusses public campaign funding in order to more broadly permit additional public financing models	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; California Common Cause	
CRC 36	Requires that a special election be called when a vacancy in City offices occur and the vacancy occurs more than one year before the expiration of the term of office; Special election must be held within 180 days of the vacancy	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 37	Authorizes the Independent Redistricting Commission to hire separate legal counsel; Includes an annual minimum budget allocation of \$10M for the Independent Redistricting Commission	California Common Cause	
CRC 38	Removes several provisions in Section 803 as its relates to LAUSD and adds these references to the Municipal Code		
CRC 39	Includes language throughout the Charter that strengthens language access requirements to ensure that the City adopts		

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	and maintains policies that are accessible to the languages spoken by its residents		
CRC 40	Includes language that references Public Banking provisions, as outlined similarly in State Law		
CRC 41	Expands on Neighborhood Councils (NCs) authority by outlining their ability to conduct community outreach via stakeholder engagement, and collaboration with City departments, elected officials, and other NCs	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	
CRC 42	Requires that NCs are allowed to provide public comment via telephone or online teleconferencing at all meetings of the Council and its Committees; Requires that NCs be placed in a separate queue for public comment if a Community Impact Statement has been submitted; extends these provisions to City Boards and Commissions	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	
CRC 43	Expands the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners (BONC) from seven to nine commissioners; the two additional commissioners shall be appointed by interested individuals who obtain the approval of a majority of all Neighborhood Councils; authorizes the Board to approve contracts and	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	leases prepared on behalf of NCs or the NC system; requires that all board members complete legally-required training before voting at meetings		
CRC 44	Allows NCs to submit statements with respect to legislation proposed to or pending before a governmental agency	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	
CRC 45	Allows NCs via the Chair of the Board of Neighborhood Councils, or another designated Commissioner, to submit to the Mayor their budget requests for the next fiscal year	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	
CRC 46	Allows NCs to submit (via a majority vote) to Mayor questions that could be asked during the interview process for the General Manager of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	
CRC 47	Updates the title of Section 905 to "Initial Implementation of the Plan"	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 48	Changes the title of Section 907 "Early Warning System" to "Advance Notice and Opportunities for Input"	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 49	Capitalizes "Neighborhood Council" throughout the Charter	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Los Angeles Neighborhood Coalition	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
CRC 50	Replaces the word "Citizen" with "Civic" participation throughout Article IX (Neighborhood Councils	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 51	Replaces the word "officers" with Board Members in Department of Neighborhood Empowerment Charter provisions	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 52	Updates the title of Section 904 to "Development and Maintenance of the Neighborhood Council Plan	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 53	Updates certification and bylaws requirements for NCs by removing provision stating that NC membership is open to "everyone who lives; works or owns property in the area"; indicates that "stakeholders" will be further defined by ordinance	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	
CRC 54	Includes a provision that states that the authority of the Board of Police Commissioners to issue instructions to the Chief of Police shall not supersede the authority of the Council to adopt ordinances governing the policies of the Chief and the Police Department; Notes that any ordinances adopted by the Council shall supersede the Board of Police Commissioners' authority	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles Police Commission; Board of Police Commissioners
CRC 55	Requires the Police Department to purchase	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles Police Commission; Board

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	liability insurance for each police officers; Coverage cannot be less than \$1M and cost of insurance should not exceed \$50 per month; Cost of insurance shall be adjusted by CPI; Indicates that if an officer is found liable, any payments to the opposing party shall be paid out using the insurance payout first before paying from the General Fund		of Police Commissioners
CRC 56	Includes a new section in Charter Section 245 that allows the Council veto actions of the Board of Police Commissioners; Vetos will be sent back to the Board of Police Commissioners for their consideration, and may concur with the Council, override the Council's veto, or modify the Board's original action; If the Board overrides the Council's action, the action shall be transmitted to the Council and the Council shall have the same authority to act on a matter as that originally held by the Board	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles Police Commission; Board of Police Commissioners
CRC 57	Includes a provision in Section 1070 (Rights and Due Process Procedures) that allows the Council to consider a personnel determination made by the Police Board of Rights and have the ability to veto and remand the matter	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles Police Commission; Board of Police Commissioners

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	back to the Board of Rights for reconsideration; the Board of Rights shall have 30 days to reconsider the action and determine whether to override the Council; if the Council action is overridden, the Council shall consider the override and shall have the same authority to act on the matter as that originally held by the Board of Rights		
CRC 58	Includes language that requires the Chief of Police to ensure that the Police Departments supports and protects the constitutional rights of all persons, specifically their rights to assemble and protest; includes a provision that states that the Chief of Police can directly remove officers if they have engaged in misconduct	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council	Los Angeles Police Commission
CRC 59	Authorizes the creation of a two-year operating budget consisting of two consecutive fiscal years that includes the following associated provisions: creation of a Four-Year Strategic Plan that identifies the City's goals and priorities; shifts the departmental timeline for budget estimates to December 1 instead of January 1; shifts the timeline for the Mayor's submittal of a proposed biennial budget to April 1st	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; Streets for All; San Fernando Valley Young Democrats	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
	instead of April 20th; requires public comment for the proposed biennial budget to occur over at least three separate dates during the Budget Committee's consideration (first day of hearings, final day of hearings, and another of the Committee's choosing) and at least once during the Council's consideration		
CRC 60	Requires departmental performance evaluations with potential proposed adjustments to Departments for the second year of the biennial cycle; requires the CAO to develop a Mid-Term Biennial Budget Report that provides updated expenditures and revenue projections; Requires Council and Mayoral approval of report		
CRC 61	Replaces language for the letting of contracts from "lowest responsive and responsible bidder" with "best value" language for competitive bidding and competitive sealed proposals	Harbor Department; Los Angeles World Airports	
CRC 62	Removes the ordinance requirement for the letting of contracts pursuant to competitive sealed proposals	Harbor Department; Los Angeles World Airports	
CRC 63	Allows exceptions to lowest bid requirements for critical infrastructure and software	Harbor Department; Los Angeles World Airports	

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
CRC 64	Allows contracting authority to cure technical/administrative defects as it relates to violations of campaign contribution related disclosures;	Los Angeles World Airports	
CRC 65	Allows the Department of Airports, Harbor Department, and Department of Water and Power are authorized to enter into 66 year leases, subject to the approval of the Council	Los Angeles World Airports	
CRC 66	Requires periodic review of the City Charter every ten years through the creation of a Charter Reform Commission consisting of 13 members, and gives the Commission the authority to submit Charter amendments directly to the voters without Mayor and/or Council approval	Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council; San Fernando Valley Young Democrats	
<i>Council Motions</i>			
25-0118	Motion (McOsker - Soto-Martinez) and CLA report: require the Port of Los Angeles to maintain a Public Access Investment Plan; integrate a Workforce Impact Report requirement into Port-related decisionmaking		American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA); California Building Industry Association; California Business Properties Association; California Business Roundtable; California Business & Industrial Alliance; California Consumer Advocates for

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
			Affordability and Safety; California Farm Bureau; California Fuels and Convenience Alliance; California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; California Manufacturers and Technology Association; California Metals Coalition; California Retailers Associations; California Small Business Association; Council of Business & Industries; Family Business Association of California; Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce; Harbor Trucking Association (HTA); Inland Empire Economic Partnership (IEEP); Long Beach Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles County Taxpayers Association; NAIOP California, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association; NAIOP SoCal, the

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
			Commercial Real Estate Development Association; National Retail Federation; Pacific Maritime Association (PMA); Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA); San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership; Southern California Leadership Council; Supply Chain Federation; The Two Hundred for Home Ownership; United Latinos Action; Valley Industry & Commerce Association
26-0426-S2	Motion (McOsker - Padilla): Integration of a Workforce Impact Report framework into Port-related decisionmaking		
26-0489-S3	Motion (Soto-Martinez - Harris-Dawson): Require a regular schedule of fee studies.		
26-0489-S1	Report: Los Angeles City Employees' Retirement System Proposed Charter Reforms		
26-0489-S2	Motion (Jurado - Hutt, et al.): Phased increase of the annual appropriation to RAP from 0.0325 of assessed value of all property to 0.0650.		

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
26-0489-S4	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Composition of Neighborhood Appeals Commission with appointees from Area Planning Commissions		
26-0489-S5	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Evaluation of the Ethics Inspector General and its relationship with other City Inspector Generals		
26-0489-S6	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Evaluation of voting reforms, including Ranked Choice Voting, Approval Voting		
26-0489-S7	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Evaluation on impacts and costs associated with bifurcating the City Attorney's office and establishment of an Office of Legal Counsel		
26-0489-S8	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Clarification of suspension for misconduct of all elected officials.		
26-0637	Motion (McOsker - Park): Allowing Port Wardens to elect to participate in LACERS rather than LAFPP.		
26-0638	Motion (Soto-Martinez - Jurado): Noncitizen voting in elections for City offices and members of the LAUSD Board of Education		

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
26-0647	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Require appointees to Boards and Commissions to submit Ethics-related disclosure forms prior to a Council vote		
26-0658	Motion (Rodriguez - Blumenfield): Prohibition on an appointed caretaker or appointee from seeking election to the appointed Council District for five years.		
26-0659	Motion (Padilla, Park - McOsker): Increase the local residency requirements on the Board of Airport Commissioners to three members within the area surrounding Los Angeles International Airport and two members within the area surrounding Van Nuys Airport.		
26-0656	Motion (McOsker - Blumenfield): Remove full-time employment requirement for Board of Public Works members.		
26-0654	Motion (Raman - Blumenfield): Assign responsibility to the Department of Public Works to construct, operate, and maintain facilities that are not in the public right-of-way, but under which the City has an agreement to do so.		

Table 1 – Disposition of Proposed Charter Amendments

Reference Number	Commission Subject	Support	Opposition
<i>Departmental Recommendations</i>			
Personnel #1	Change number of exempt positions in the City		
Personnel #2	Revise examination rules		
Personnel #3	Increase military credits and create option to combine open and promotional lists		
Personnel #4	Transfer administrative authority from the Civil Service Commission to the General Manager of Personnel		
<i>Committee Deliberations</i>			
Rules #1	Replicate any changes made to police in the charter sections to LAFD as well, as they largely mirror each other in the Charter.		
Rules #2	Strengthen independence of the Police Department Inspector General.		
Rules #3	Amend section 104(B) regarding the LA River Bed		
Rules #4	Revise Section 242 to revise the Council conduct of meetings section.		