



COMPRISED OF
THE POLICE OFFICERS
OF THE CITY
OF LOS ANGELES

LOS ANGELES POLICE PROTECTIVE LEAGUE

A PROFESSIONAL POLICE UNION

1308 WEST EIGHTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE (213) 251-4554
FACSIMILE (213) 251-4566
www.lapd.com



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RICHARD MENDOZA
PRESIDENT

CHRISTIAN WECKER
VICE PRESIDENT

DEBBIE THOMAS
SECRETARY

RALPH CAMPOS
TREASURER

MATTHEW GARZA
DIRECTOR

CRAIG LALLY
DIRECTOR

DAVID MANRIQUEZ
DIRECTOR

JAMIE MCBRIDE
DIRECTOR

June 18, 2026

Matthew W. Szabo
City Administrative Officer
City of Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

SEND VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Re: Los Angeles Police Protective League's Demand To Meet and Confer In Good Faith Over Ballot Measures Amending the Powers of the Board of Police Commissioners

Dear Mr. Szabo:

The Los Angeles Police Protective League ("LAPPL") is the exclusive bargaining unit for the 8,600 Los Angeles Police Officers the rank of Lieutenant and below. In that capacity, we make the following demands based upon becoming aware of the subject matter of this letter.

It has come to the attention of the LAPPL that the City intends to place on this November's ballot a measure or measures which will amend the language of the Los Angeles City Charter as it relates to the powers of the City Council to establish LAPD policy, including but not limited to, City Charter section 245. A document entitled "Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee Report" describing the proposed amendments is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Items 22 through 24 in Exhibit A are described as relating to "Police and Fire."

The LAPPL hereby demands that the City of Los Angeles ("City") meet and confer in good faith with the LAPPL regarding the proposed amendments as required under the Meyers-Milius-Brown Act (Government Code section 3500 *et seq.*, "MMBA"), specifically Government Code sections 3504.5 and 3505 and the City's Employee Relations Ordinance ("ERO"), specifically section 4.830.

Moreover, to the extent that the proposed amendments are not within the scope of bargaining, the LAPPL hereby demands that the City meet and confer in good faith with the LAPPL regarding the bargainable effects of the proposed amendments, which present foreseeable significant and adverse changes affecting officer compensation, discipline and safety. Finally, the LAPPL demands that the City refrain from placing on the ballot any

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 2

measures seeking to enact the proposed amendments until it has completed the meet and confer process, which necessarily includes the exhaustion of any and all post-impasse procedures.

If the City takes action prior to completing the meet and confer process, the LAPPL shall file an unfair labor practice charge pursuant to ERO section 4.860 and shall also file a lawsuit in Superior Court seeking a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) preventing the City and City Clerk from placing the proposed measures on the ballot.

Based on comments by you during a City Council meeting on June 17, 2026, it appears that the City is planning to take one or both of the following positions in relation to this matter: 1) The City has already complied with its obligations under the MMBA; and 2) The City is not required to meet and confer in good faith with the LAPPL under the MMBA/ERO regarding the proposed amendments. As we shall demonstrate below, neither has any merit.

1) The City Has Not Complied With Government Code Section 3504.5 With Respect To Items 22-24 In Exhibit A

Government Code section 3504.5, subdivision (a) provides, in pertinent part:

Except in cases of emergency as provided in this section, the governing body of a public agency, and boards and commissions designated by law or by the governing body of a public agency, shall give reasonable written notice to each recognized employee organization affected of any ordinance, rule, resolution, or regulation directly relating to matters within the scope of representation proposed to be adopted by the governing body or the designated boards and commissions and shall give the recognized employee organization the opportunity to meet with the governing body or the boards and commissions.

Authority of the Public Employment Relations Board (“PERB”) holds that notice is only adequate if: (1) the person receiving formal notice or obtaining actual notice is a union official with authority to act on behalf of the organization on the matter in question; (2) the union official recognizes, or reasonably should recognize, the change in or potential impact on a bargainable topic; and (3) there remains sufficient time for the union to consult with bargaining unit members, formulate a plan of action, draft information requests and receive responses, craft counterarguments and/or proposals, and bargain in good faith to impact or agreement before the employer reaches a firm decision (for bargainable decisions) or begins implementation (for decisions outside the scope of representation that have bargainable effects). (*City of Sacramento* (2013) PERB Decision No. 2351-M, pp. 28-30, 37, 39-40.)

As described thoroughly in the June 16, 2026 letter from LAPPL President Ricky Mendoza to the City Council, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, although the City contends that, on or about February 23, 2026, it notified the LAPPL of its intent to place Charter amendments on the ballot, the City did not notify LAPPL of any proposed amendments affecting employees for whom the LAPPL is the recognized employee organization, the Los Angeles

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 3

Police Department (“LAPD”), or the Board of Police Commissioners until this week. It certainly did not notify the LAPPL of items 22-24 contained in Exhibit A. Thus, there is no way that the LAPPL could have or should have been able to recognize the proposed changes described in items 22-24.

Additionally, as also specified in Mendoza’s June 16, 2026, letter, the manner in which the City notified LAPPL that it was proposing other Charter amendments, through an email list whereby spam-like material was directed to an unspecified group of recipients, including former LAPPL President Craig Lally, was infirm.

- 2) *Items 22-24 Constitute Significant Changes Within The Scope Of Representation Or Which Require Bargaining Over Its Effects*
 - a) The Proposed Amendments Constitute Significant Changes Designed To Increase City Council’s Ability To Establish LAPD Policy

During City Council’s June 17, 2026 session, various City Council members and Supervising City Attorney Michael Dundas offered comments about why Items 22-24 were necessary, whether they constituted changes in existing law, and how they change the law. Councilperson Eunisses Hernandez claimed that the proposed amendments do not change the law; according to her, the amendments clarify the law and bring “accountability and clarity to existing law.”

Councilperson Hugo Soto-Martinez said that the City Council has been told that it does not have policymaking authority and that these amendments would clarify that it had policymaking ability. He also listed a number of disagreements with the policy positions taken by the Board of Police Commissioners and argued that the proposed amendments were necessary to assert the ability of City Council to make policy. The policy areas referenced by Mr. Soto-Martinez include the authorization of overtime and whether LAPD police officers should advise, through the use of bullhorns, about the right to remain silent during Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) activity.

Supervising Assistant City Attorney Michael Dundas made plain the effects of Items 22 and 23 respectively:

As to Item 22: ... what it would do is give the City Council the power to set policy going forward in the future that would then bind the LAPD to specific policy actions....

As to Item 23: For almost all of the Boards including the Board of Police Commissioners, the Council’s power under Charter Section 245 is to veto that action and send it back to the Board for reconsideration of that action.... This would then give this Council the power not just to veto them, but if the Commission didn’t accept the policy, the direction that was being given implicitly by the veto, and it came back to the Council, the Council could step

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 4

into the shoes and actually move the policy itself without needing the board to take any action just like you currently have with Charter section 245(e) in the Planning Department. So that is a change moving from veto power to a policy making power.

A review of Item 23 makes it obvious that the proposed amendments are designed to enhance the power of the City Council in policymaking affecting the LAPD. It states, in pertinent part, in bold language: **“This additional authority applies only in matters related to policies, regulation, procedures and programs of the Police Department.”**

Though not discussed during the Council meeting, Item 24 is designed to strike any authority of the Board of Police Commissioners to direct the Inspector General not to commence or continue an investigation. This is clearly designed to reduce the authority of the Board of Police Commissioners and to enhance the authority of the Inspector General and clearly constitutes a change in the law.

Contrary to the comments of Ms. Hernandez, a review of the relevant Charter sections makes it apparent that Items 22-23 are also clear changes.

Charter section 240 states:

All legislative power of the City **except as otherwise provided in the Charter** is vested in the Council and shall be exercised by ordinance, subject to the power of veto or approval by the Mayor as set forth in the Charter. Other action of the Council may be by order or resolution, not inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities set forth in the Charter or ordinance. **Except as otherwise specifically provided in the Charter**, the Council shall have full power to pass ordinances upon any subject of municipal concern.

Thus, the Charter recognizes that the legislative power of the City Council is limited by the Charter. (Cal. Const., art. XI, §5(a) [charter city may make and enforce ordinances and regulations in respect to municipal affairs “subject only to restrictions and limitations provided in their several charters].) Charter section 571 confers certain powers on the Board of Police Commissioners. It states, in pertinent part:

(b) The Board of Police Commissioners shall have the power to:

(1) issue instructions to the Chief of Police concerning the exercise of the authority conferred on the Chief of Police by the Charter, other than the disciplinary authority conferred by Section 1070;

(2) evaluate the Chief of Police annually, set or adjust the compensation for the Chief of Police within the salary guidelines established by Council after recommendations concerning those

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 5

guidelines have been made to the Council by the City Administrative Officer; and forward a copy of the evaluation and salary determination to the Mayor and Council for information;

(3) appoint and remove an Executive Director whose position shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the Charter and who shall not be a member of the Police Department; and

(4) appoint and remove an Inspector General of the Police Department subject to Section 245, whose position shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of Article X of the Charter and who shall not be a member of the Police Department.

Thus, the City Council does not have the power given to the Board of Police Commissioners in Section 571. For example, it does not have any power to issue instructions to the Chief of Police concerning the exercise of the authority conferred on the Chief of Police.

Section 245 then describes the City Council's right to veto actions taken by the Board of Police Commissioners:

Actions of boards of commissioners 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 by two-thirds vote to bring the action before it or to waive review of the action, except that as to any action of the Board of Police Commissioners regarding the removal of the Chief of Police, the time period within which the Council may act before the action of the Board shall become final shall be ten meeting days during which the Council has convened in regular session.

However, Section 245, subsection (a) makes clear that, although the City Council may veto action taken by a board, "Except as provided in subsection (e), the Council may not amend, or take any other action with respect to the board's action." Subsection (e) provides, with respect to the Planning Commission, "The Council shall not be limited to veto of actions of the City Planning Commission or Area Planning Commissions, but, subject to the time limits and other limitations of this section, after voting to bring the matter before it, shall have the same authority to act on a matter as that originally held by the City Planning Commission or Area Planning Commission." No similar authority is provided after vetoing decisions of the Board of Police Commissioners; Item 23 proposes a new grant of that authority to the City Council.

With respect to the language of Item 22, it states:

*Nothing in this section shall limit any authority of the Council otherwise conferred by this Charter, and no interference shall be drawn from this section restricting the subjects upon which the Council may legislate, **including its authority establishing the***

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 6

policy of the Police Department, except that the Council shall not pass any ordinance that does any of the following:

(Bold added, italics in the original.) While the purported language seems to indicate that it is not changing the status quo, the fact of the matter is that the City Council does not have any authority to establish the policy of the Police Department. Thus, the language purporting to “clarify” that the City Council has always had authority to establish the policy of the Police Department, when it has no such authority, is actually being used to help establish that the Council somehow has always had authority to set Police Department Policy.

In sum, it is apparent that the proposed amendments are all changes designed to limit the power of the Board of Police Commissioners and, as to Items 22 and 23, give policymaking power to City Council.

- b) The City Is Required To Meet And Confer In Good Faith With LAPPL Prior To Placing The Proposed Amendments On The Ballot

MMBA section 3505 requires a public agency to meet and confer in good faith with representatives of recognized employee organizations concerning matters within the scope of representation. It is an unfair practice for a public agency to refuse or fail to comply with this obligation. (§ 3506.5, subd. (c).) Public agencies must comply with the MMBA’s meet-and-confer requirements before submitting to voters an initiative affecting matters within the scope of representation. (*Boling v. Public Employment Relations Board* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 898 (“*Boling*”), 915; *People ex rel. Seal Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Seal Beach* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 591 (“*Seal Beach*”), 597-60.)

As PERB explained in *City and County of San Francisco* (2022) PERB Decision No. 2846-M, pp. 17-18:

In determining whether an employer’s decision is within the scope of representation under MMBA section 3504, we first determine into which of three categories of managerial decisions the decision falls: (1) ‘decisions that “have only an indirect and attenuated impact on the employment relationship” and thus are not mandatory subjects of bargaining,’ such as advertising, product design, and financing; (2) ‘decisions directly defining the employment relationship, such as wages, workplace rules, and the order of succession of layoffs and recalls,’ which are ‘always mandatory subjects of bargaining’; and (3) ‘decisions that directly affect employment, such as eliminating jobs, but nonetheless may not be mandatory subjects of bargaining because they involve “a change in the scope and direction of the enterprise” or, in other words, the employer’s “retained freedom to manage its affairs unrelated to employment.”’ (*County of Orange* (2018) PERB Decision No. 2594-M, p. 18 (*Orange*), quoting *International Assn. of*

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 7

Fire Fighters, Local 188, AFL-CIO v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (2011) 51 Cal.4th 259, 272-273 (Richmond Firefighters.)

When a decision falls into the third category, we first determine whether the decision has ‘a significant and adverse effect on the wages, hours, or working conditions of the bargaining-unit employees’ that ‘arises from the implementation of a fundamental managerial or policy decision.’ (*Claremont, supra*, 39 Cal.4th at p. 638; *Orange, supra*, PERB Decision No. 2594-M, pp. 19-20.) If both requirements are met, we determine whether ‘the employer’s need for unencumbered decision making in managing its operations is outweighed by the benefit to employer-employee relations of bargaining about the action in question.’ (*Claremont, supra*, 39 Cal.4th at p. 638; *Orange, supra*, PERB Decision No. 2594-M, pp. 17, 19- 20.)

Here, the proposed amendments are either category two decisions directly defining the employment relationship, such as wages, workplace rules, and the order of succession of layoffs and recalls, which are always mandatory subjects of bargaining, or they are category three decisions, ‘decisions that directly affect employment, such as eliminating jobs, but nonetheless may not be mandatory subjects of bargaining because they involve “a change in the scope and direction of the enterprise”’ or, in other words, the employer’s “retained freedom to manage its affairs unrelated to employment.

PERB has clarified that “category two decisions—those that ‘directly defin[e] the employment relationship’—must be bargained even if they are not adverse to bargaining unit members.” (*San Francisco, supra*, at p. 16.)

If they are category three decisions, whether a change is “significant and adverse” must be viewed “from the perspective of a reasonable employee.” (*County of Sonoma* (2023) PERB Dec. No. 2772a-M, p. 16.) A change is “significant” if it is “large or important enough to have an effect or to be noticed.” [Citation.]” *Id.* at p. 9.) A “significant effect is also ‘adverse’ whenever “a reasonable employee in the same circumstances ‘would consider the action to have an adverse impact on the employee’s employment’.” (*Ibid.*, citing *Newark Unif. Sch. Dist.* (1991) PERB Decision. No. 864, pp. 11-12.) The impact is to be assessed “prospectively, without the benefit of hindsight. The effects must be reasonably likely to occur, not proven to have already occurred.” [Citations.]” (*County of Sonoma, supra*, PERB Dec. No. 2772a-M at p. 18.)

Based on the representations of City Councilpersons about the reasons for the changes, it is reasonably likely that the grant of power to the City Council will result in decreases to compensation (in the form of reduced overtime), an increase in officer discipline (greater accountability) and a decrease in officer safety (placing officers in situations where they may be in conflict with ICE officers). Compensation (*County of Sacramento* (2020) PERB Decision No. 2745-M, p. 20; *Laguna Salada Union School District* (1995) PERB Decision No. 1103-E, pp. 11, 13; Long Beach Unified School District (1983) PERB Decision No. 0325-E); discipline (*Eastex*

Matthew W. Szabo

Re: LAPPL Demand to Meet and Confer

June 18, 2026

Page 8

Inc. v. NLRB (1978) 437 U.S. 556, 569; *Long Beach Police Officer Assn. v. City of Long Beach* (1984) 156 Cal.App.3d 996, 1011; *Vernon Fire Fighters v. City of Vernon* (1980) 107 Cal.App.3d 802, 815); and safety (*Fire Fighters Union v. City of Vallejo* (1974) 12 Cal.3d 608, 620; *N.L.R.B. v. Gulf Power Company* (5th Cir. 1967) 384 F.2d 822) are all mandatory subjections of bargaining.


As such, pursuant to the *Boling* and *Seal Beach* cases, the City must comply with the MMBA's meet-and-confer requirements before submitting to voters the proposed amendments relating to matters within the scope of representation.

3) *Conclusion*

Please inform me by June 25, 2026, whether the City will meet and confer with LAPPL regarding the changes described in Items 22-24 and whether the City will refrain from placing such amendments on the November 2026 ballot until it has completed the meet and confer process, including all post-impasse procedures.

Very truly yours,

THE LOS ANGELES POLICE PROTECTIVE LEAGUE

By: 

Robert R. Rico
General Counsel

RRR; JM
Exhibits

EXHIBIT A

RULES, ELECTIONS, AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT relative to a Chief Legislative Analyst and Charter Reform Commission reports relative to recommendations for amendments to the City Charter, in accordance with Ordinance No. 188303.

The Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee (Committee) met seven times in the course of a month to deliberate on the entire docket of Charter Reform recommendations submitted by the Charter Reform Commission (CRC), City Departments, and Motions from multiple Councilmembers.

On June 12, 2026 and June 15, 2026, the Committee considered the Chief Legislative Analyst report dated June 10, 2026, relative to the 2026 Charter Reform proposals along with many of the Motions introduced by members of the City Council. The Committee concurred with many of the CLA recommendations and proposed their own recommendations. The Committee dictated that the actions taken on the CLA recommendations that correspond to the standalone Motions introduced by members, be made applicable as actions to those Motions.

After consideration and having provided multiple opportunities for public comment, the Committee moved the CLA report as amended to the full City Council.

Additionally, please see the CLA's attached table summarizing the Committee's disposition of the recommendations for reference. This matter is now submitted to the Council for its consideration.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. DETERMINE that the Charter amendments to be presented for the November 2026 ballot are 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).

Present to Voters in November 2026 Ballot

Public Works

2. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to remove references to the existing Bureaus of the Department of Public Works in the Charter (Section 507). (CRC 1)
3. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with Charter Reform Recommendation (CRC) No. 1 to change Section 581 and 582 to empower the Director of Public Works and better define this role in relation to the Board of Public Works. (CRC 1)
4. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to allow any changes relative to the Board of Public Works, to be enabled by ordinance.

5. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter 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 2)
 - Upon voter approval of this amendment, request the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance related to the creation of a Capital Improvement Program.

Recreation and Parks

6. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Section 593 related to the Charter-mandated minimum allocation for the Department of Recreation and Parks, as follows (CRC 4):
 - Increase the RAP's budget allocation to 0.0485% of assessed property value;
 - Phase the increase to the RAP's budget over a period of four years;
 - Allow suspension of up to 30 percent of Charter-mandated funds if City declares a fiscal emergency
7. Instruct the CAO and RAP to report with recommendations for setting a time-limited requirement of a percentage of this increase to be dedicated to capital improvements.
8. Instruct RAP and CAO to coordinate a working group to engage the County in preparation for a possible 2028 ballot measure, in order to ensure a fair share of funding for the City in any Countywide measure or by doing our own measure to identify revenue for our park systems and programs. (CRC4)

Planning

9. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 6 to restructure the Area Planning Commissions into a new Neighborhood Appeals Commission consisting of seven members, and allow the Commission to consider issues *de novo* in appeals. (CRC 6)
 - Instruct the Planning Department to report on the impacts of the proposal on the approval of affordable housing projects.
10. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 7 that amends Section 245(e) to create 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. The Commissions' action on remand shall be referred to Council for a final vote and the Council must act within 21 days or the action of the Commission becomes final. (CRC 7)
11. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 8, which deems a General Plan Amendment (GPA) approved by the City Council if the Council does not act within 75 days of the City Planning Commission and Mayor's approval of the GPA. (CRC 8)

12. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 9 which grants Council the authority to exceed the existing FAR of 13:1 via ordinance. (CRC 9)
13. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 10 to streamline quasi-judicial decisionmaking. (CRC 10)
 - Request the City Attorney to consult with the Department of City Planning to identify the details that can be moved into ordinance, including those pertaining to the Office of the Zoning Administrator, to create more flexibility for the Planning Department.

Budget and Finance

14. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to remove Charter Section 104(g) related to the Business Enterprises restriction in the Charter. (CRC 11)
15. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Section 291 to include the "Chief Financial Officer" role and debt management duties among the powers and duties of the CAO. (CRC 13)
16. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter 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. (CRC 59)
 - Instruct the CAO and City Attorney to report if there are other Charter amendments that are necessary to effectuate the two-year budget.

Ethics and Elections

17. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 27 to prohibit a member of the Ethics Commission and the Executive Director of the Ethics Commission from running for City office or LAUSD Board of Education office for at least five years following the expiration of the term of office. (CRC 27)
18. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 32 that 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. This maximum amount should be adjusted according to CPI. This should not include the provision as proposed by the CRC that prohibits the use of campaign funds to pay for violations. (CRC 32)
19. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 38 to remove several provisions in Section 803 concerning the Los Angeles Unified School District and add these references to the Los Angeles Municipal Code. (CRC 38)
20. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Section 461(a) to change the signature requirement for referendary petitions from 10 percent to 15 percent. (Rules #5)

Neighborhood Councils

21. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the following provisions in the Charter related to Neighborhood Councils (CRC 47 - CRC 53):
- Update the title of Section 905 to "Initial Implementation of the Plan";
 - Change the title of Section 907 to "Advance Notice and Opportunities for Input";
 - Capitalize "Neighborhood Council" throughout the Charter;
 - Replace the word "Citizen" with "Civic" participation throughout Article IX;
 - Replace the word "officers" with "Board Members" in the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment's Charter provisions; and, capitalizes references to "Neighborhood Councils"
 - Update the title of Section 904 to "Development and Maintenance of Neighborhood Council Plan; and, capitalizes references to "Neighborhood Councils"; and,
 - Remove provisions in the Charter stating that Neighborhood Council membership is open to "everyone who lives; works or owns property in the area" and replaces this with "stakeholders," which will be further defined by ordinance; and capitalizes references to "Neighborhood Councils"

Police and Fire

22. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to consistent with the recommendations in CRC 54, with the following additional language (CRC 54):

Nothing in this section shall limit any authority of the Council otherwise conferred by this Charter, and no interference shall be drawn from this section restricting the subjects upon which the Council may legislate, including its authority establishing the policy of the Police Department, except that the Council shall not pass any ordinance that does any of the following:

- (a) directs, prohibits, or otherwise controls the conduct of, or the deployment of personnel or equipment in a particular incident, investigation, or operation; or*
- (b) directs or otherwise controls the authority of the Chief of Police over the appointment, discharge, or discipline of specific individual employees under Sections 574 Or 1070.*

As used in this section, "policies" mean rules, regulations, standards, procedures, or directives of general application, whether applicable to the Department as a whole or to any bureau, division, unit program, or function of the Department.

23. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter relative to the Council's veto of Board of Police Commissioners actions to amend Section 245 to expand the authority of the Council to veto specific actions of the Board of Police Commissioners, as follows (CRC 56):

*The Council may assert jurisdiction of an action of the Board of Police Commissioners **related to policies, regulations, procedures and programs of the Police Department** and may, by a two-thirds vote, veto the action. Upon the Council's first veto of such an action, the Board of Police Commissioners shall have 30 days to take up the matter again and either override the Council's veto, or modify the Board's prior action, which modification shall start the process anew. An action of the Board of Police Commissioners to override the veto of the Council shall be transmitted to the Council,*

where it shall be taken up on second and final consideration. During the second and final consideration, the Council may veto the action by two-thirds vote and, should it do so, shall have the same authority to act on the matter as that originally held by the Board of Police Commissioners. If the Council fails to act within 21 calendar days of receiving the override transmittal, the original action of the Board of Police Commissioners shall become final. Further, Council shall have independent policy authority to act on an item if the Board of Police Commissioners fails to act on an item returned to the Board for reconsideration within 60 days.

This additional authority applies only in matters related to polices, regulation, procedures and programs of the Police Department. This would not apply to matters related to the deployment of personnel or equipment in particular incident, investigation or operation, or to matters related to the Chiefs authority over the appointment, discharge, or discipline of specific individual employees under Charter Sections 574 or 1070.

For all other matters approved by the Board of Police Commissioners, the Council may assert jurisdiction of the action and may, by a two-thirds vote to veto those actions, which are remanded to the Board of Police Commissioners under the process that is authorized under the current language of Charter Section 245.

Further, clarify that the Councils power to review personnel decisions via Section 245(d)(7) is limited to Board actions related to the Police Chief and does not apply to other personnel decisions by the Board.

24. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Section 573 related to the Inspector General of the Police Department and Section 523 related to the Independent Assessor of the Fire Department 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. (Rules #2)

Contracting and Procurement

25. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 63, which allows exceptions to lowest bid requirements for critical infrastructure and software. (CRC 63)
26. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 64 to allow a contracting authority to cure technical/administrative defects as it relates to violations of campaign contribution related disclosures. (CRC 64)
27. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter consistent with CRC 65 to allow the Department of Airports, Harbor Department, and LADWP to enter into 66 year leases, subject to Council approval. (CRC 65)

Personnel

28. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Section 1005 consistent with Recommendation No. 2 in the Personnel Department's communication, dated May 26, 2026, to add language that allows for limited exceptions to be

articulated in the Civil Service Rules to evaluate candidates based on whether they meet the requirements of the position. (Personnel #2)

29. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Section 1006 to increase seniority credits for military candidates from 5 percent to 10 percent. (Personnel #3b)
30. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Sections 1003, 1004, 1013, and 1014 consistent with Recommendation No. 4 in the Personnel Department's communicated, dated May 26, 2026, to transfer administrative authority from the Civil Service Commission to the General Manager of the Personnel Department. (Personnel #4)

Miscellaneous

31. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to strengthen language access in Charter Section 103, and elsewhere in the Charter as appropriate. This Charter amendment should include provisions stating that any specific obligations be created via ordinance. (CRC39)
32. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to remove Charter Section 242(a), which pertains to the Council conduct of meetings from the Charter. (Rules #4)
 - Upon approval by the voters, request the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance that incorporates the provisions of Charter Section 242(a) related to the Council conduct of meetings into the Los Angeles Administrative Code.
33. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend Charter Section 514(b)(7) related to the ability of the Mayor and Council to reorganize the Police Department and Fire Department to remove the phrase "or character." (Rules #6)
34. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to repeal Section 104(a) related to restrictions on the City's ability to mortgage properties. (Rules #7)

Forwarded to Council without Recommendation (Motion Required)

Police

35. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to include language that requires the Chief of Police to ensure that the Police Department supports and protects the constitutional rights of all persons, specifically their rights to assemble and protest; and, includes a provision that states that the Chief of Police can directly remove officers if they have engaged in misconduct. (CRC 58)
 - This proposal is forwarded to the Council without a recommendation, pending a declaration of impasse.

Elections and Ethics

36. 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. (C.F. 26-0638)
- This proposal is forwarded to the Council without a recommendation.

Personnel

37. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to increase the number of exempt positions in the City, as outlined in Recommendation No. 1 from the Personnel Department's reports, dated May 26, 2026 and June 11, 2026. (Personnel#1)
- This proposal is forwarded to the Council without a recommendation, pending a declaration of impasse.
38. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the documents necessary to amend the Charter to create the option to combine Open and Promotional exam takers into a single list to allow the City to evaluate candidates from outside the City alongside internal, promotional candidates, as outlined in Recommendation No. 3 from the Personnel Department's reports, dated May 26, 2026 and June 11, 2026. (Personnel#3a)
- This proposal is forwarded to the Council without a recommendation, pending a declaration of impasse.

Administrative Code Changes

39. Request the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance to amend the Administrative Code that further develops 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. (CRC 66)

Items for Further Study

40. Instruct the City Administrative Officer, with the assistance of the City Attorney, to report on the impacts and costs associated with bifurcating the City Attorney's Office as proposed by the Charter Reform Commission, and on the impacts and costs of establishing an Office of Legal Counsel within the Chief Legislative Analyst. (C.F. 26-0489-S7; CRC 14)
41. Instruct the Chief Legislative Analyst, with the assistance of the City Administrative Officer and the City Clerk, to report with an analysis of Ranked Choice Voting, Approval Voting, and any other possible voting reforms that would increase turnout and improve City elections as part of Charter reform. The analysis should include any cost associated with changing our election process and if the County will be able to administer any changes. (C.F. 26-0489-S6; CRC 22)
42. 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 28)

43. 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 Los Angeles Administrative Code or should be further defined in the Charter. (CRC 30)
44. Instruct the CLA to report on how the Council should fill an office in the event of a temporary vacancy that arises from a suspension pursuant to Charter Section 211. (CRC 31)
45. 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 34)
46. 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 35)
47. Instruct the CLA, with the assistance of the City Clerk and City Attorney, to report on the impacts and costs, and alternative timeframes for requiring special elections in the event of a vacancy. (CRC 36)
48. 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: (CRC 55)
 - A framework and implementation process for requiring every sworn LAPD officer to maintain liability insurance of not less than \$1M;
 - An analysis of available insurance providers and policy structures for providing such insurance;
 - Recommendations for establishing annual cost adjustments based on a CPI index;
 - Any legal or labor implications regarding the City's authority to require insurance coverage as a condition of employment; and
 - 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.
49. 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.).
 - Note and file CRC 60, inasmuch as the Mid-Term Biennial Budget evaluation process and report can be established by ordinance.
50. 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. (CRC 61)
51. Request the City Attorney and instruct the CLA to report on the legal and operational implications of a potential Charter amendment that would expand the Board of Police

Commissioners from five to seven members, with four members to be appointed by the Mayor and three members to be appointed by the City Council. (Rules #8)

Additionally, Recommendations No. 52-58 related to CRC 5, 12, 24, 25, 43, 62 and Rules #3 are recommended by the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee, as detailed in the CLA report, for further study.

Note and File

Recommendations No. 59-79 related to CRC 3, 15 to 21, 23, 26, 29, 33, 37, 40 to 42, 44 to 46, 57, and 60 (related to the inclusion of the Mid-Term Biennial Budget evaluation process and report, inasmuch as this can be established by ordinance), and Rules #1 are recommended to be noted and filed.

Recommendations No. 80-85 related to recommendations from the Black Worker's Center are recommended to be noted and filed in as much as a package of Motions will be introduced by the Council to further examine these recommendations at a later date.

Recommendations No. 86-107 are related to Motions that have been continued for further consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Review or noted and filed, and are outlined in the CLA's attached table.

EXHIBIT B



COMPRISED OF
THE POLICE OFFICERS
OF THE CITY
OF LOS ANGELES

LOS ANGELES POLICE PROTECTIVE LEAGUE

A PROFESSIONAL POLICE UNION

1308 WEST EIGHTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE (213) 251-4554
FACSIMILE (213) 251-4566
www.lapd.com

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RICHARD MENDOZA
PRESIDENT

CHRISTIAN WECKER
VICE PRESIDENT

DEBBIE THOMAS
SECRETARY

RALPH CAMPOS
TREASURER

MATTHEW GARZA
DIRECTOR

CRAIG D. LALLY
DIRECTOR

DAVID MANRIQUEZ
DIRECTOR

JAMIE MCBRIDE
DIRECTOR

June 16, 2026

Members of the Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Council members:

This letter is in direct response to the assertions made yesterday by the CAO, and the resulting comments from City Council members, regarding our letter re: Proposed City Charter Amendments Affecting LAPD Officers

The City has admitted in open public hearings that the proposed Charter amendments concern matters within the scope of representation. In fact, the CAO's office represented to the Council quite confidently that they had requested to meet and confer through three specific and different emails to LAPPL Director Craig Lally regarding proposed changes to civilian oversight structures, disciplinary procedures, investigatory authority, management prerogatives, and accountability systems, etc. ("Charter amendments"). The emails cited are: February 23, March 04, and May 19, 2026.

We looked, we found, and we copiously reviewed the cited emails. There is one glaring problem with all the cited emails. . . *NONE of the emails pertain to MOU24 Charter Reform amendments.* None of the emails mention the LAPPL, MOU24, or any of the reform related to LAPD oversight that are now being considered as ballot proposals for November! In fact, the emails cited were sent and received and look like "spam" each time, not addressed to a specific person, not addressed to Craig Lally, and addressed to what appears to be several City bargaining units using an internal email addressee shortcut.

While we are happy that these emails sufficed as notice for the other City bargaining units affected by the issues in the emails (see below), *none of the emails cited or their attachments pertain to the LAPPL or MOU24 members.* They most certainly did not give the LAPPL notice or request the LAPPL to meet and confer as required under the collective bargaining *process* and by the California Supreme Court under *Seal Beach*. Somebody at the CAO, City Attorney's Office, and/or ERG screwed up.

City Council members
Re: LAPPL response to CAO comments
June 16, 2026

Ironically, while searching for the three above-cited emails we came across a fourth email the CAO failed to cite. This fourth email dated June 11, 2026, was similarly spam addressed and identified as the "LBFO" pertaining to the other three above cited emails. Not surprisingly, when reviewed originally and yesterday, this "LBFO" email had ZERO to do with the LAPPL and/or MOU 24 members. Not a single mention of "LAPPL," "police," "Police Commission," "Chief of Police," "Boards of Rights," etc.. Nothing regarding the ideas now floated as police Charter reform.

The following is a direct copy/past from the body of each cited email:

FEBRUARY 2026 EMAIL:

On Mon, Feb 23, 2026, at 8:18 AM CAO ERD <cao.erd@lacity.org> wrote:

Greetings,

The attached document is being sent to you for your awareness and, where you have an interest, further discussion. On Tuesday, February 24, 2026, the Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) will deliberate on the information presented in the attached document, which outlines proposed Civil Service Charter Reform designed to modernize the City's hiring and personnel systems. The EERC will determine which proposals to present to the Charter Reform Commission prior to the full City Council's deliberations on the items that will be advanced to the voters.

Please review the attached document and respond to this email if you are interested in discussing any of the proposed items.

Thank you.

Office of the City Administrative Officer
Employee Relations Division
200 N. Main Street, Room 1200
City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 978-7676

Here, the February 23, 2026, email and attached document are not addressed to the LAPPL. It does not mention the "LAPD," "police officer," "LAPPL," or "MOU24" anywhere in it! Moreover, the four-page attached document discusses *general hiring practices under the City Charter*. Additionally, starting on page 2 and continuing to the end through page 4, the attachment discusses "priority areas of discussion for reform." None of the four sections that

City Council members
Re: LAPPL response to CAO comments
June 16, 2026

are addressed on those 2 1/2 pages discuss anything regarding police reform, the “LAPPL,” “police officer,” or “MOU 24 members.”

MARCH 4, 2026, EMAIL:

From: CAO ERD <cao.erd@lacity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 8:12 AM
To: CAO ERD City Unions - LAFPPS members <cao.erd-city-unions-lafpps-members@lacity.org>; CAO ERD City Unions - LACERS members <cao.erd-city-unions-lacers-members@lacity.org>
Subject: Re: Proposed Charter Changes on Civil Service Topics

Greetings,

Attached is a document providing the details of proposed Charter changes outlined by the Personnel Department in its correspondence to the City of Los Angeles Charter Reform Commission on February 23, 2026, distributed previously and attached to this email message. As we communicated in our email from February 23, 2026, please reply to this email message with your availability if you are interested in discussing any of the proposed items presented in the attached document.

Thank you.

Office of the City Administrative Officer
Employee Relations Division
200 N. Main Street, Room 1200
City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 978-7676

Here, quite glaringly it asked if the addressees “are interested in discussing any of the proposed items presented in the attached document.” And quite obviously, as none of the attached document information pertained to LAPPL MOU 24 members, we were not interested in discussing.

MAY 19, 2026, EMAIL:

From: CAO ERD <cao.erd@lacity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 5:02 PM
To: CAO ERD City Unions - LAFPPS members <cao.erd-city-unions-lafpps-members@lacity.org>; CAO ERD City Unions - LACERS members <cao.erd-city-unions-lacers-members@lacity.org>

City Council members
Re: LAPPL response to CAO comments
June 16, 2026

members@lacity.org>

Subject: Re: Proposed Charter Changes on Civil Service Topics

Greetings,

In furtherance of discussions regarding proposals for Charter reform, the Executive Employee Relations Committee met on Tuesday, May 19th to discuss the substance of feedback from labor organizations. Attached please find a pdf document containing revisions to the City's initial set of proposals to amend the Civil Service section of the Charter.

Additionally, the following dates are critical deadlines in the Charter reform process.

- June 4, 2026: Rules, Elections and Intergovernmental Relations Committee's deliberations are scheduled to conclude.
 - June 9, 2026: City Council is scheduled to vote on all Charter amendment proposals.
 - June 16, 2026: Last day for the City Council to adopt a motion requesting the City Attorney to prepare resolutions to place proposed measures on the ballot for the November 3, 2026, election.
 - June 26, 2026: Last day for the City Council to adopt all resolutions placing proposed measures on the ballot for the November 3, 2026, election.
-

If you are interested in discussing Charter reform proposals and have not already contacted this Office, or if you have already met with this Office and are interested in continuing discussions, please contact this Office immediately to schedule a meeting.

Thank you.

Office of the City Administrative Officer
Employee Relations Division
200 N. Main Street, Room 1200
City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 978-7676

Here, once again the email and attachment states, "Attached please find a pdf document containing revisions to the City's *initial set of proposals*." (Emphasis added). Once again, the email and attachment pertain to the two-prior unrelated LAPPL/MOU 24 emails.

JUNE 11, 2026, EMAIL (located by LAPPL):

From: CAO ERD <cao.erd@lacity.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:05 AM

City Council members
Re: LAPPL response to CAO comments
June 16, 2026

To: CAO ERD City Unions - LACERS members <cao.erd-city-unions-lacers-members@lacity.org>; CAO ERD City Unions - LAFPPS members <cao.erd-city-unions-lafpps-members@lacity.org>; Lee.turner@ladwp.com; Robert.holst@ladwp.com; andy.kendall@mea-ladwp.org; lbew18@ibewlocal18.org; Jenita Igwealor <Jenita.igwealor@seiu721.org>
Subject: Re: Proposed Charter Changes on Civil Service Topics

Greetings,

In furtherance of discussions regarding proposals to reform various provisions of Article X (Employment Provisions) of the Los Angeles City Charter (Charter), the City is transmitting for your consideration a revised proposal to the previous proposals transmitted on February 23, 2026, March 4, 2026, and May 19, 2026.

Please find attached the City's Last, Best, and Final Offer (LBFO) on Charter reform proposals relative to various Civil Service provisions. The LBFO reflects valuable input from stakeholders collected from discussions that have occurred since early March 2026.

For your reference...

- The Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst has issued its [report](#) (2026 Charter Reform Proposals) to the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee made part of Council File No. [26-0489](#).
- The remaining discussions around the Charter reform process are scheduled as follows:
 - [Friday, June 12, 2026](#): The City Council's Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee is scheduled to conclude deliberations, thereby transmitting recommendations to the full City Council.
 - [Wednesday, June 17, 2026](#): Last day for the City Council to adopt a motion requesting the City Attorney to prepare resolutions to place proposed measures on the ballot for the November 3, 2026 election.
 - [Tuesday, June 30, 2026](#): Last day for the City Council to adopt all resolutions placing proposed measures on the ballot for the November 3, 2026 election.

Dates and times are subject to change. Please refer to the City Council's [Government Meetings & Agendas](#) web page for updates.

Please reply to this email message at your earliest convenience with consideration paid to the timing of the Charter reform process if you are interested in discussing the City's LBFO.

City Council members
Re: LAPPL response to CAO comments
June 16, 2026

Thank you.

Office of the City Administrative Officer
Employee Relations Division
200 N. Main Street, Room 1200
City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 978-7676

Well organized email, however once again unrelated to the LAPPL or MOU 24 members. And just so you know what the LBFO was that is unrelated to MOU 24, see below:

Last, Best, and Final Offer Proposed Charter Changes on Civil Service Topics Revised June 11, 2026

Page 1 of 3

Section 1001. Exemptions.

(a) (4) Two All positions in the class of Assistant General Manager or Deputy Director in each City office or department, with the exception of the Department of Water and Power, which shall be limited to one Senior Assistant General Manager and two Assistant General Managers in each of the Department of Water and Power's systems: Water, Joint and Power, and two all positions in the class of Assistant Director in each of the Public Works Bureaus of Contract Administration, Engineering, Sanitation, Street Lighting and Street Services, and two all positions in the class of Deputy Controller in the Office of Controller.

(a) (19) Persons specially employed by the City Clerk and the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, as authorized by the provisions of Section 405 of the Charter, to assist in the conduct of any election.

(b) Management, Professional, Scientific or Expert Services. In addition to those positions described in subsections (a), (c) and (d) of this section, up to 150 persons 1% of the regular authorized positions of the City departments to provide management services or to render professional, scientific or expert services of an exceptional character to offices or departments, excluding the Department of Water and Power, Harbor Department, and the Department of Airports for purposes of this section and its subparts (b)(1), (2), and (3). The proprietary departments shall be eligible for additional positions approved by Council under subsection (b)(4). including the Proprietary Departments. The number of regular authorized positions shall be determined annually by the City Administrative Officer. Should a subsequent annual determination of the number of authorized positions decrease from the year prior, no

exempt position shall lose their exempt position for this purpose except by attrition.
Appointments under this subsection shall be subject to the following:

(c) Proprietary Department Positions. In addition to the exempt positions in the Proprietary Departments created by subsections (a), (b)(1), (2), (3) (4) and (d) of this section, up to 0.5% of 15 40 positions in the Department of Water and Power and up to 3% of ten 10 positions to be allocated between the in Harbor Department and the 3% of 50 positions in the Department of Airports for employment of persons to provide management services or to render professional, scientific or expert services of an exceptional character. The number of regular authorized positions shall be determined annually by the City Administrative Officer. Should a subsequent annual determination of the number of authorized positions decrease from the year prior, no exempt position shall lose their exempt position for this purpose except by attrition. Exemption of these positions shall be subject to the following:

(d) (1) positions of vocational workers, apprenticeships, and trainee classes unskilled laborers, including drivers:

(d) (3) any position requiring the services of one individual for not more than half time (1,040 hours in a service year) and paying a salary not to exceed three-fourths of the monthly rate established by the salary fixing authority of the department, division or office for entering-level clerical positions;

(e) Leave of Absence from Civil Service. Each person exempted or appointed to an exempt position under this section shall, during the period of exempt employment, be considered as being on leave of absence from the classified civil service if at the time of exemption he or she holds a position following completion of a probationary period in the classified civil service, or is entitled to hold a position therein, and shall continue, during such period, to accrue seniority credit the same as though serving in such position.

Last, Best, and Final Offer Proposed Charter Changes on Civil Service Topics Revised June 11, 2026

Page 2 of 3

Section 1003. Classification of Positions.

The general manager of the Personnel Department Board of Civil Service Commissioners Board of Civil Service Commissioners shall establish classes for all positions of employment. Each class shall be given an appropriate title and shall include all positions sufficiently similar in respect to duties and responsibilities and that have the same requirements as to education, experience, knowledge and ability; the same tests of fitness; and to which the same schedule of compensation may apply with fairness.

The positions classified by the general manager of the Personnel Department board shall allocate all positions to constitute the classified civil service of the City, and no appointment to any of these positions shall be made except in accordance with the rules adopted by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners under the authority of this Article (the civil service rules).

Section 1005. Examinations.

Positions in the classified civil service shall be filled through competitive examination, based on merit for the job classification subject to exceptions as indicated under Civil Service Rules Sec. 4.3. Positions identified under Civil Service Rule 4.3 may be filled through an assessment based on merit demonstrated by meeting examination requirements. Applicants shall be subject to review of education, experience, qualification, skill, ability, and and/or and character and may be disqualified if it is determined specified requirements are not met. Examinations shall be practical and shall relate to those matters that will fairly test assess test the relative capacity of the persons examined to discharge the duties of the position to which they applicants seek to be appointed and, when appropriate, shall include or exclusively consist of, test of physical qualifications, and manual skill. No limitation or restriction whatsoever shall be imposed, excepting to the extent permitted by applicable state or federal law in the departments of fire and police, fixing a maximum age in excess of which persons shall be deprived from taking examinations for or being employed in the classified civil service. The provisions of Section 104(i) regarding discrimination on the basis of age shall not prohibit fixing a maximum age in the departments of fire and police if otherwise authorized by this section.

Section 1006. Credit for Military Service.

(a-e) Increase from 5% to 10%.

Section 1009. Promotion.

The general manager of the Personnel Department through the classified civil service process will determine the filing basis for each assessment board shall by its rules provide for promotion in the classified civil service on the basis of ascertained merit and seniority in service and examination. and shall provide, in all cases where it is practicable, that vacancies shall be filled by promotion. All assessments examinations for promotion shall be competitive based on merit, including an appropriate measure of knowledge, skill, experience, and talent among those individuals members of lower ranks who apply for the assessment examination and who have the experience and qualifications required by the board as a prerequisite for taking the assessment examination. The general manager of the Personnel Department shall submit to the appointing authority for each promotion the names of eligible applicants in accordance with Section 1010 (Certification). (Section 1009)

In rating eligible candidates, the board shall make an allowance of credits for past service. The announcement of the examination shall state that credits will be given for past service. In rating eligible candidates, the board shall make an allowance of credits for past service. The announcement of the examination shall state that credits will be given for past service. Upon the written request of the appointing authority, and approval of the general manager of the Personnel Department, the Board of Civil Service Commissioners general manager of the Personnel Department may 1) certify the names of those applicants having the highest ratings on the open competitive eligible list whose scores before adjustment for preferential credits are higher than the score of the highest available applicant on the promotional eligible register after credits for past service have been added or 2) certify the names of those open and promotional applicants having the highest ratings on the assessment examination on one combined register of eligibles. Names of candidates shall may be removed from the register of eligibles for promotion after they have remained on the register for two years without re-examination (Section 1009)

Last, Best, and Final Offer Proposed Charter Changes on Civil Service Topics Revised June 11, 2026

Page 3 of 3

Section 1013. Temporary Appointment.

(a) Length of Appointment. To prevent stoppage of public business or to meet extraordinary exigencies, any appointing authority may make temporary appointments to classified positions in accordance with civil service rules that the board shall prescribe. The board general manager of the Personnel Department shall have the power to authorize such temporary appointments until an eligible list is established, but for no longer than one year.

(b) Termination. Any temporary appointment shall terminate immediately when a regular appointment can be made unless the board board general manager of the Personnel Department finds that for a specified period it is necessary that the temporary employee remain to orient or train the new regular appointee.

Temporary and Intermittent Appointments. The civil service rules shall provide for the tenure of persons appointed from a register of eligibles to positions determined by the board board general manager of the Personnel Department to be temporary or intermittent in character. Any rules adopted pursuant to this subsection shall provide that when appointment is made to a position determined to be temporary or intermittent, the provisions of Section 1011 with respect to period of probation and completion of appointment shall not apply.

Section 1014. Special Reassignments.

City Council members
Re: LAPPL response to CAO comments
June 16, 2026

(a) Reassignment Without Examination. In addition to and notwithstanding the provisions of Section 1015, the board general manager of the Personnel Department may by its rules provide for status and seniority for civil service employees in classes other than those for which they were examined, where:

END OF EMAILS.....

Accordingly, the LAPPL respectfully requests that the Council respect both the rule of law and the *collective bargaining process*, which should result in the immediate suspension of further consideration of any Charter amendments affecting MOU 24 LAPD officers.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Los Angeles Police Protective League

Sincerely,



Ricky Mendoza, President

Cc: Robert R. Rico, General Counsel
Matthew Szabo, CAO