

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Roseanne Landay

**Date Submitted:** 06/15/2026 09:30 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0774

**Comments for Public Posting:** The ULA tax exemption for Palisades residential properties must be amended to include condo & townhome HOAs. Many HOAs are being forced to dissolve because there is no assistance for meeting insurance/rebuild gaps. Most HOAs don't receive what little insurance proceeds they have unless they rebuild. That means in the end, the only thing the owners receive is their share of what the HOA gets for the sale of the land. After losing their home and their greatest financial asset, what little they have left will be subject to the ULA tax before they get their small share. This is insult to injury to injury! Condo and townhomes are the more affordable housing of the Palisades. 55% of my HOA neighbors are seniors. Many others are essential workers. Please stop this inequity! Include condo and townhome HOAs in the ULA tax exception.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carlos Singer

**Date Submitted:** 06/15/2026 02:01 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0774

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Ms. Feldstein Soto and Mr. Michaelson: The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce writes to share its view that many tools are available to the Mayor and City Council to reform Measure ULA through legislation — and to identify a small number of points on which legal counsel would meaningfully advance the City’s ability to act with confidence. We recognize that Measure ULA is not an ordinary ordinance. It was enacted by the voters, and its text requires that any legislative amendment serve to advance the measure's core purposes and remain consistent with its prescribed funding structure. The Citizens Oversight Committee plays a defined role in reviewing proposed changes against that standard. None of that, however, forecloses the meaningful reform package the Chamber and many other stakeholders have advanced for over a year. We believe the Council has sufficient legal authority, within those constraints, to enact changes that would substantially improve ULA's performance without returning to the ballot. The most economically significant reforms involve how the tax applies — or does not apply — to newly constructed housing. We believe the Council may lawfully exempt new multifamily construction and commercial transactions from the ULA tax for a defined period of years and may similarly adopt rate adjustments or caps on transfers occurring after that initial period. The legal basis is straightforward: a tax structure that actively suppresses housing production undermines the very mission ULA was designed to advance. Reforms that restore construction activity expand both the future revenue base and the supply of housing the measure exists to fund. They advance ULA's purposes, they do not contradict them. We recognize that the "further or facilitate" standard requires a demonstrable connection between any amendment and ULA's goals. We would welcome a rigorous legal analysis of how that standard applies when the benefit of a reform is realized over time — as is necessarily the case with construction exemptions that stimulate development activity whose fruits accrue over years, not months. A clear statement of the evidentiary framework the City Attorney views as sufficient to meet that standard would be invaluable to the Council as it considers specific proposals. Furthermore, we believe the Council retains meaningful discretion to adjust how ULA revenues are

deployed across program categories, and to add, modify, or reprioritize uses of funds, provided those changes remain within the measure's core commitment to affordable housing production and homelessness services. A City Council that can respond to changing conditions — shifting resources toward programs that are working and away from those that are stalled — will make ULA more effective, not less consistent with the voters' intent. The Chamber would welcome confirmation of any outer limits on such flexibility, particularly with respect to the duration of temporary reallocations. The Council clearly has authority to establish a more rigorous performance framework governing how ULA funds are administered. Performance targets, transparent public reporting, multi-year programmatic goals subject to Mayoral and Council approval, and meaningful conflict-of-interest rules applicable to program administrators are all squarely within the Council's ordinary legislative power. They do not diminish what voters approved — they make good on the promise of it. We urge the Council to proceed on this front without delay, independent of any broader reform package. Another potentially consequential legal question involves what happens when the Council and the Citizens Oversight Committee disagree. The measure subjects legislative amendments to Committee review, but the Council is not simply bound by whatever the Committee concludes. We believe the Council may proceed over a Committee objection where it can point to substantial evidence — grounded in rigorous analysis, documented findings, and a clear articulation of how the proposed change advances ULA's purposes — that the amendment meets the governing standard. The Chamber's goal is a version of Measure ULA that fulfills its promise to the City's residents — one that generates the housing, services, and accountability that voters intended when they passed it. We are convinced that the Mayor and Council have the legal tools to get there, and we look forward to working with all interested stakeholders to put those tools to use.

June 15, 2026

Hydee Feldstein Soto  
City Attorney  
200 North Main Street #800  
Los Angeles, California 90012

David Michaelson  
Counsel to the Mayor  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: **Existing City Authority to Modify Measure ULA**

Dear Ms. Feldstein Soto and Mr. Michaelson:

The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce writes to share its view that many tools are available to the Mayor and City Council to reform Measure ULA through legislation — and to identify a small number of points on which legal counsel would meaningfully advance the City's ability to act with confidence.

We recognize that Measure ULA is not an ordinary ordinance. It was enacted by the voters, and its text requires that any legislative amendment serve to advance the measure's core purposes and remain consistent with its prescribed funding structure. The Citizens Oversight Committee plays a defined role in reviewing proposed changes against that standard. None of that, however, forecloses the meaningful reform package the Chamber and many other stakeholders have advanced for over a year. We believe the Council has sufficient legal authority, within those constraints, to enact changes that would substantially improve ULA's performance without returning to the ballot.

The most economically significant reforms involve how the tax applies — or does not apply — to newly constructed housing. We believe the Council may lawfully exempt new multifamily construction and commercial transactions from the ULA tax for a defined period of years and may similarly adopt rate adjustments or caps on transfers occurring after that initial period. The legal basis is straightforward: ***a tax structure that actively suppresses housing production undermines the very mission ULA was designed to advance. Reforms that restore construction activity expand both the future revenue base and the supply of housing the measure exists to fund. They advance ULA's purposes, they do not contradict them.***

We recognize that the "further or facilitate" standard requires a demonstrable connection between any amendment and ULA's goals. We would welcome a rigorous legal analysis of how that standard applies when the benefit of a reform is realized over time — as is necessarily the case with construction exemptions that stimulate development activity whose fruits accrue

over years, not months. A clear statement of the evidentiary framework the City Attorney views as sufficient to meet that standard would be invaluable to the Council as it considers specific proposals.

Furthermore, we believe the Council retains meaningful discretion to adjust how ULA revenues are deployed across program categories, and to add, modify, or reprioritize uses of funds, provided those changes remain within the measure's core commitment to affordable housing production and homelessness services. ***A City Council that can respond to changing conditions — shifting resources toward programs that are working and away from those that are stalled — will make ULA more effective, not less consistent with the voters' intent.*** The Chamber would welcome confirmation of any outer limits on such flexibility, particularly with respect to the duration of temporary reallocations.

***The Council clearly has authority to establish a more rigorous performance framework governing how ULA funds are administered.*** Performance targets, transparent public reporting, multi-year programmatic goals subject to Mayoral and Council approval, and meaningful conflict-of-interest rules applicable to program administrators are all squarely within the Council's ordinary legislative power. They do not diminish what voters approved — they make good on the promise of it. We urge the Council to proceed on this front without delay, independent of any broader reform package.

Another potentially consequential legal question involves what happens when the Council and the Citizens Oversight Committee disagree. The measure subjects legislative amendments to Committee review, but the Council is not simply bound by whatever the Committee concludes. ***We believe the Council may proceed over a Committee objection where it can point to substantial evidence — grounded in rigorous analysis, documented findings, and a clear articulation of how the proposed change advances ULA's purposes — that the amendment meets the governing standard.***

The Chamber's goal is a version of Measure ULA that fulfills its promise to the City's residents — one that generates the housing, services, and accountability that voters intended when they passed it. We are convinced that the Mayor and Council have the legal tools to get there, and we look forward to working with all interested stakeholders to put those tools to use.

Respectfully submitted,



Carlos Singer  
Chief Policy Officer

cc: Council President and City Council  
Mitch Kamin, Chief of Staff to the Mayor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mary Leslie

**Date Submitted:** 06/15/2026 04:51 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0774

**Comments for Public Posting:** June 15, 2026 Los Angeles City Council 200 North Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 RE: LABC Support for Yaroslavsky - Lee Amendment to Reform ULA Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and Honorable Members of the LA City Council, On behalf of the Los Angeles Business Council (LABC), a business research and advocacy organization representing more than 550 members across all industry sectors working to advance innovative public policy that strengthens our economy while improving quality of life for all, we write in support of Councilmember Yaroslavsky and Lee's amendment to CF 26-0782 to reform Measure ULA. LABC believes in the goals of Measure ULA: building more housing, increasing affordability, preventing homelessness, and providing dedicated resources to address Los Angeles' housing crisis. These goals remain urgent and worth protecting. But protecting Measure ULA's mission requires confronting the evidence that has emerged since the measure went into effect. As currently structured, Measure ULA is creating barriers to the very housing production, investment, and economic activity Los Angeles needs to meet its affordability and homelessness goals. Independent research from UCLA, RAND, Harvard, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, and others tells a consistent story: Measure ULA is reducing high-value property transactions, slowing multifamily housing production, virtually eliminating any new commercial and multifamily investment, and weakening the broader property-tax base that supports essential public services. These impacts reduce the amount of funding available to achieve ULA's goals and also affect the City's broader fiscal health, including revenues that support parks, streetlights, fire, paramedic, and other core services. This concern is also reflected in findings from the Los Angeles County Assessor's Office. According to public reporting from the Ad Hoc Committee's discussion, the Assessor's Office found a "definite decline" in property tax revenue growth in the City of Los Angeles since Measure ULA took effect. Scott Thornberry, Assistant Assessor for Los Angeles County, specifically noted the impact on commercial and industrial properties, stating that the decline was occurring in the City of Los Angeles but not elsewhere in the County. This reinforces the concern that ULA is not only affecting real estate transactions, but also reducing the

long-term property-tax growth that funds essential local services. These reforms are not about ending Measure ULA. They are about making Measure ULA work. Los Angeles cannot solve its housing crisis by imposing costs that make new housing harder to finance, harder to build, and harder to transact. A 15-year exemption for new multifamily and residential mixed-use construction is a practical and necessary correction that will help restore confidence in Los Angeles as a place to build housing. Reducing the transfer tax rate on multifamily and mixed-use properties will provide greater long-term certainty, improve project feasibility, and help unlock private capital at a time when public resources alone cannot meet the scale of the crisis. Recognizing the need to act urgently, LABC respectfully urges the City Council direct the City Attorney to prepare ballot language to place meaningful Measure ULA reform before voters for consideration in the November general election. A clear, comprehensive reform package will give voters the opportunity to preserve ULA's core purpose while fixing the provisions that are undermining housing production, affordability, investment, and fiscal stability. Los Angeles needs more housing, more affordability, more accountability, and a stronger local economy. Councilmember Yaroslavsky and Lee's amendment is an important step toward a more workable Measure ULA framework that can better fulfill the goals for which Angelenos voted. Sincerely, Mary Leslie President Los Angeles Business Council



June 15, 2026

Los Angeles City Council  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: LABC Support for Yaroslavsky - Lee Amendment to Reform ULA

Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and Honorable Members of the LA City Council,

On behalf of the Los Angeles Business Council (LABC), a business research and advocacy organization representing more than 550 members across all industry sectors working to advance innovative public policy that strengthens our economy while improving quality of life for all, we write in support of Councilmember Yaroslavsky and Lee's amendment to CF 26-0782 to reform Measure ULA.

LABC believes in the goals of Measure ULA: building more housing, increasing affordability, preventing homelessness, and providing dedicated resources to address Los Angeles' housing crisis. These goals remain urgent and worth protecting. But protecting Measure ULA's mission requires confronting the evidence that has emerged since the measure went into effect. As currently structured, Measure ULA is creating barriers to the very housing production, investment, and economic activity Los Angeles needs to meet its affordability and homelessness goals.

Independent research from UCLA, RAND, Harvard, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, and others tells a consistent story: Measure ULA is reducing high-value property transactions, slowing multifamily housing production, virtually eliminating any new commercial and multifamily investment, and weakening the broader property-tax base that supports essential public services. These impacts reduce the amount of funding available to achieve ULA's goals and also affect the City's broader fiscal health, including revenues that support parks, streetlights, fire, paramedic, and other core services.

This concern is also reflected in findings from the Los Angeles County Assessor's Office. According to public reporting from the Ad Hoc Committee's discussion, the Assessor's Office found a "definite decline" in property tax revenue growth in the City of Los Angeles since Measure ULA took effect. Scott Thornberry, Assistant Assessor for Los Angeles County, specifically noted the impact on commercial and industrial properties, stating that the decline was occurring in the City of Los Angeles but not elsewhere in the County. This reinforces the concern that ULA is not only affecting real estate transactions, but also reducing the long-term property-tax growth that funds essential local services.



These reforms are not about ending Measure ULA. They are about making Measure ULA work. Los Angeles cannot solve its housing crisis by imposing costs that make new housing harder to finance, harder to build, and harder to transact. A 15-year exemption for new multifamily and residential mixed-use construction is a practical and necessary correction that will help restore confidence in Los Angeles as a place to build housing. Reducing the transfer tax rate on multifamily and mixed-use properties will provide greater long-term certainty, improve project feasibility, and help unlock private capital at a time when public resources alone cannot meet the scale of the crisis.

Recognizing the need to act urgently, LABC respectfully urges the City Council direct the City Attorney to prepare ballot language to place meaningful Measure ULA reform before voters for consideration in the November general election. A clear, comprehensive reform package will give voters the opportunity to preserve ULA's core purpose while fixing the provisions that are undermining housing production, affordability, investment, and fiscal stability.

Los Angeles needs more housing, more affordability, more accountability, and a stronger local economy. Councilmember Yaroslavsky and Lee's amendment is an important step toward a more workable Measure ULA framework that can better fulfill the goals for which Angelenos voted.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mary Leslie". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mary Leslie  
President  
Los Angeles Business Council

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mend It, Don't End It Coalition  
**Date Submitted:** 06/15/2026 05:24 PM  
**Council File No:** 26-0774  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Attached is a letter from the Mend It, Don't End It Coalition.



**June 15, 2026**

Council President Marqueece Harris-Dawson  
Los Angeles City Council  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: Council File No. 26-0782, Jurado/Padilla Amending Motion**

Dear Council President Marqueece Harris-Dawson and Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council,

The Mend It, Don't End It Coalition appreciates the work of the Council's Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate potential reforms to Measure ULA and to consider pathways for improving the implementation of the measure. We welcome the continued engagement of the Council, City Attorney, and stakeholders on these issues.

At the outset, we want to be clear about the Coalition's perspective: we are agnostic as to the vehicle for reform. Whether Measure ULA is revised through a ballot initiative or a legislative amendment process, the vehicle is not the central issue for us. The policy outcomes are. As we have made clear, the Coalition seeks structural and programmatic reforms that will spur the production of affordable housing, increase flexibility in the use of ULA revenues to address the City's urgent homelessness and affordability crises, and establish a governance and accountability framework that ensures public funds are used effectively and transparently.

In that regard, on May 29, 2026, Councilmembers Jurado and Padilla introduced an Amending Motion, intended to lead to an ordinance authorizing a pilot program for tax relief from Measure ULA's 4% transfer tax for certain affordable housing developments.<sup>1</sup> While we appreciate the Council's willingness to consider amendments to Measure ULA and view this discussion as a constructive step forward, the Amending Motion does not address the fundamental barriers to housing production, housing affordability, and real estate investment that have emerged under Measure ULA. As a result, it falls well short of the reforms necessary to unlock housing development at the scale Los Angeles requires and should not be interpreted as satisfying the objectives advanced by the Coalition.

In addition, the Amending Motion endorses a legislative amendment process for Measure ULA. This is not the first time the Council has sought to modify Measure ULA by legislative amendment. Prior efforts, such as the creation of an exemption for victims of the Palisades wildfires, have not moved forward because the City Attorney determined that Council does not have the authority to make such

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2026/26-0782\\_misc\\_jur\\_pad\\_item%208\\_5-29-26.pdf](https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2026/26-0782_misc_jur_pad_item%208_5-29-26.pdf)

reforms or the Council's authority is limited. Given those unsuccessful attempts, it is essential that there be a shared understanding of the legal framework governing any legislative amendment to Measure ULA. The central threshold question is straightforward: what authority do the Mayor and the City Council have to amend or modify Measure ULA without returning to the voters? This is a question of authority and process requiring consensus among all seeking to improve Measure ULA, regardless of whether there are disagreements over specific policies.

As we understand the legislative amendment framework, Measure ULA is not like an ordinary ordinance that the Council may freely revise. Rather, Measure ULA constrains—or at a minimum, significantly restrains—the Council's amendment authority. There are several key limitations, many of which have been previously identified by the City Attorney:

1. Amendments must “further or facilitate” ULA's stated purposes;
2. Monies in the House LA Fund must continue to be expended consistently with the measure's prescriptive funding provisions;
3. Amendments may not increase the tax or diminish oversight and prevailing wage requirements; and
4. The Citizens Oversight Committee must review proposed amendments, with the Council required to support any contrary determination with “substantial evidence” if the Committee concludes that the proposed legislative reform does not satisfy the foregoing.

*See* L.A. Muni. Code at Sec. 22.618.8; *see also* Report No. R26-0042, Jan. 16, 2026: Report Re: United to House Los Angeles (Measure ULA) Tax Exemptions Relating to Residential Property Transfers After the Palisades Fire and the Sale of Property Owned by Non-Profit Organizations Where the Proceeds Would Be Used for the Purpose of Building Affordable Housing

We respectfully ask the Council and the City Attorney to confirm whether that is the shared legal understanding. If it is, then the next question is what reforms can realistically be achieved through legislation alone. That question matters because the Coalition's interest is not in temporary or symbolic changes, but in durable reforms that will produce measurable housing and homelessness-prevention outcomes.

For example, in January 2026, the City Attorney concluded that a proposed exemption tied to future affordable housing development elsewhere in the City presented an “indeterminable prospect,” lacked a “direct nexus” between the transfer and the future construction, and likely would not align with the measure's goal of timely project completion. *Id.* The same issue may be present for the Amending Motion. It could be argued that the proposed pilot lacks a direct and measurable nexus between the tax benefit and the production of new affordable housing because it is time-limited and accompanied by a delayed tax credit design (which may not yield development in a specified, limited five-year period). Absent enforceable requirements tying the tax credit to concrete and timely development there is at least a question as to whether the proposed pilot would timely or meaningfully further ULA's stated purposes, as required by Section 22.618.8.

The reality is, if the legal reasoning from January 2026 applies more broadly, there are obvious questions about the viability of greater, structural reforms such as future-looking exemptions or tax

reductions. How, for example, would citywide exemptions for new affordable housing development, geographically targeted exemptions, or tax caps on qualifying projects be structured to satisfy the “further or facilitate” standard and any other applicable legal requirements?

The same questions arise with respect to the use and allocation of funds. Measure ULA does not necessarily authorize the creation of new spending categories unless those uses remain within the measure’s specified expenditure framework. It is also not clear if and when the Council and the City Attorney will consider what restrictions apply to proposed revisions to Measure ULA under state law—and specifically, under Proposition 13. For example, what revisions to Measure ULA, such as expanding the permissible uses of ULA funds, would constitute the re-imposition (re-enactment, or re-establishment) of a special tax? In at least one case, a California court has determined that changes in the permissible uses of tax funds may be viewed as the imposition of a special tax, and therefore subject to voter approval, rather than City Council approval.<sup>2</sup>

If reforms are sought to allow greater flexibility among House LA categories, or to expand prevention-related uses such as interim or transitional housing, what is the legal roadmap for incorporating those changes into a legislative amendment that remains consistent with Measure ULA’s purposes and spending limitations?

Finally, if governance reform is also part of a legislative amendment agenda—as the Coalition believes it should be—what provisions of Measure ULA provide the basis for establishing a stronger accountability structure? Specifically, what authority exists to create performance-based accountability metrics, require five-year performance goals, or require mayoral and council review of those goals? And what about the constraints on the Council? How will those be solved when we need the Council to act quickly and comprehensively both now and in the future? The Coalition strongly supports a framework that measures outcomes, tracks whether public funds are being used as intended, and allows City leadership and the public to evaluate whether the system is delivering results. But we believe those reforms should proceed on a legally sound foundation.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Council, with input from the City Attorney and the Citizens Oversight Committee, articulate a clear legal roadmap addressing what may and may not be accomplished through legislative amendment with respect to: exemptions, tax caps, bonding authority, use of funds, in-year allocation of funds, the role of the Oversight Committee, and the creation of accountability measures. If a legislative amendment pathway can in fact produce the structural and enduring reforms the Coalition seeks, we welcome that process. If it cannot, then a ballot measure should remain under active consideration as the vehicle for meaningful reform.

We appreciate the opportunity to continue this conversation and look forward to working constructively with the Council to ensure that any reform process—whatever its form—produces practical, durable, and accountable improvements to Measure ULA.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Roseville*, 106 Cal.App.4th 1178, 1189-90 (2003). Relatedly, we recommend that the City Council develop a list of potential amendments to Measure ULA, and analyze whether Prop. 13 would allow the City Council to effect these changes, or whether these changes must be accomplished through a ballot measure. If the City Council chooses to enact changes that even appear to violate Prop. 13, this could result in years-long litigation, and delay the implementation of much-needed revisions.

Sincerely,

The Mend It, Don't End It Coalition



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alan Morelli

**Date Submitted:** 06/15/2026 10:04 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0774

**Comments for Public Posting:** This ULA tax exemption is critical for all of us who lost our homes. But condo and town homes should be included. The ULA tax exemption must be amended before it is passed so that it includes condo & townhome HOAs, many of whom are being forced to dissolve because there is no assistance for meeting insurance/rebuild gaps. Most HOAs don't receive what little insurance proceeds they have unless they rebuild. That means, in the end, the only thing owners receive is their share of what the HOA gets for the sale of the land. After losing their home and their greatest financial asset, what little they have left will be subject to the ULA tax before they get their small share. Please amend the exemption to include condo and townhome HOAs in the ULA tax exception and pass it!