



STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
**GOVERNANCE REFORM TASK FORCE**  
EARVIN "MAGIC" JOHNSON RECREATION AREA  
905 E. EL SEGUNDO BLVD  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90059



**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2025, 5:00 P.M.**

---

## **I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Land Acknowledgment.

**Chair Marcel Rodarte called the meeting to order at 5:20 pm. Jayson Chan, administrative staff, conducted roll.**

**A quorum was initially established with 11 members present of 13 seats. Subsequently, Member Fasana arrived at 5:23 pm and Member Gironas arrived at 5:27 pm, with 13 members present of 13 seats.**

**Present:** Nancy Yap, Brian Calderón Tabatabai, Derek Steele, Rosa Soto, Sara Sadhwani, Marcel Rodarte, David Phelps, Steve Neal, Julia Mockridge, Derek Hsieh, David Green, Gabriela Gironas, John Fasana, and Interim Director Shadi Kardan.

**Absent:** None

**Present:** Norayr Zurabyan, Assistant County Counsel; Liliana Campos, Assistant County Counsel; and Peter Bollinger, Assistant County Counsel.

**The Los Angeles County Land Acknowledgement was played.**

2. Approval of Minutes
  - Action Item: Approval of the August 27, 2025, Meeting Minutes

**Member Sadhwani requested one revision to the August 27, 2025, Meeting Minutes.**

**Member Steele also inquired on the process for members to participate remotely in the GRTF meetings, to which Parliamentarian Zurabyan provided an explanation.**

**Member Green motioned to approve the Meeting Minutes as amended, seconded by Member Hsieh. Hearing no objection, the Meeting Minutes were approved as amended.**

**Attachments:** [August 27, 2025, Meeting Minutes](#)

[August 27, 2025, Meeting Minutes \(Revised\)](#)

## **II. DISCUSSIONS**

3. Presentations on Measure G

Presentation by County Counsel: Overview of Measure G

---

Presentation by County Counsel on the key milestones of Measure G and the GRTF scope of work as directed in the November 26, 2024, Board motion.

Presentation by Interim Director Shadi Kardan: Proposed Scope of Work on the Focus Areas

**Member Sadhwani asked when the presentation materials on this item were added to the agenda and whether it required a 72-hour advance posting. Parliamentarian Zurabyan explained that the agenda entry accurately represented the item and satisfied the Brown Act which was posted 72-hours in advance. He added that attachments themselves do not have to comply with the 72-hour posting rule but must be made available to the public if posted online or shared with a majority of the members.**

**Assistant County Counsel Campos and Assistant County Counsel Bollinger provided a presentation on the key milestones of Measure G and the GRTF focus areas.**

**Member Steele and Chair Rodarte inquired about the reporting structure shown in the proposed County of Los Angeles organizational chart, specifically asking how GRTF recommendations would be handled by the Board and how any disagreements would be resolved. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger indicated that if the GRTF proposes recommendations that conflict with Measure G, the disagreement can only be resolved by taking the issue back to the voters.**

**Member Fasana expressed that County Counsel should have dual reporting to both the Board and the new elected County Executive. In response, the Assistant County Counsel indicated that County Counsel would be appointed by and report directly to the Elected County Executive, but would continue to advise the Board as do all other County departments.**

**Chair Rodarte inquired about the balance of power between the Board and the elected County Executive, specifically asking about the Board's veto authority. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger stated the County Executive is believed to have veto power over Board actions. He added that the Board does have authority to veto the County Executive's appointments by a two-thirds vote, but cautioned that this understanding would need to be confirmed, as the system has not yet been put into practice.**

**Member Hsieh inquired about the County Counsel's relationship with the elected Sheriff, District Attorney, and Assessor. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger clarified that although County Counsel reports to the County Executive, Los Angeles County is the singular client, meaning services are provided to all three elected officers.**

**Hsieh then questioned who County Counsel's client would be if a conflict arose between the departments, the County Executive, and the Board. Assistant County Counsel Campos explained that State law identifies specific conditions that must be met for a conflict to be declared. Absent these specific circumstances, County Counsel would continue to advise the County as a whole.**

**Finally, Member Sadhwani contributed relevant external examples, referencing the State Attorney General's use of ethical walls to separate attorneys working for different**

parts of the State, and citing the LA City Controller's recommendation to the City's Charter Commission for independent budget authority and access to outside counsel.

Member Sadhwani asked who was the lead Counsel for the GRTF. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger responded that he, Assistant County Counsel Campos, and their team of attorneys collectively share responsibility for advising the GRTF.

Member Sadhwani inquired about the November 26, 2024, directive, specifically requesting that County Counsel provide an update on the tasks assigned by the Board concerning ex parte communications and delegated authority. Assistant County Counsel Campos responded that the public report was posted on February 11, 2025, and has been available on the Measure G website. She noted the report includes recommendations—such as ex parte communication rules—on how to best ensure the Ethics Commission's independence from the Board and the County Executive.

Member Fasana asked for clarification on whether the ex parte issue applied to the GRTF as a whole or to individual members. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger clarified that the discussion concerned options for ex parte communications between GRTF members and the Board, noting that formal procedures for members speaking with their appointing Board officers do not currently exist, and he is unaware of any existing restrictions.

Member Sadhwani asked if the report included recommendations on term limits for the County Executive, to which Assistant County Counsel Campos replied that she did not believe so.

Member Steele then inquired about the process for adding new recommendations, specifically those concerning the County Executive. Assistant County Counsel Campos responded by clarifying the GRTF's mandate: the November 26, 2024, Board motion tasks the GRTF with using both County Counsel's February 2025 report and the October 2024 Ethics Reform Report to develop recommendations for implementing Measure G.

Member Steele asked if recommendations outside of Measure G's scope would require voter approval or if the Board could approve them. Assistant County Counsel Campos explained that it would be difficult to provide a definitive answer without understanding the specific circumstances but reiterated that the GRTF's core task is to develop recommendations for implementing Measure G and its effects.

Member Hsieh inquired whether County Counsel would return to answer detailed questions from the GRTF. Chair Rodarte stated that it is his expectation that all County resources should be made available to the GRTF.

Member Mockeridge asked for clarity on the Director of Budget and Management's role. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger explained that the Director, who works under the County Executive, is responsible for working with County departments on the budget, after which the County Executive submits the final recommendation to the Board for approval.

Member Fasana questioned the feasibility of implementing County budget recommendations by 2028, citing the challenge of achieving net-neutral costs and the need to potentially identify County surpluses. Chair Rodarte responded that he had requested a County budget overview from the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to help both the GRTF and the community better understand the budget process.

Chair Pro Tem Yap sought clarification from County Counsel regarding the GRTF's exploration into "grey areas" of policy. She specifically asked two questions: whether County Counsel would advise on those recommendations *before* they were sent to the Board, and what the proper procedure was for engaging that legal advice. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger confirmed that County Counsel could provide the advice, requesting the questions be submitted in advance, and they be allowed sufficient time to respond. Assistant County Counsel Campos then assured the GRTF of County Counsel's ongoing support for their work.

Member Steele inquired whether recommendations must incorporate specific elements or if the GRTF only needed to consider those elements during development. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger responded that the Board had been explicit regarding how recommendations must be made and what subjects must be addressed within them.

Member Sadhwani how much County Counsel charges hourly. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger responded that the typical rate for County departments is around \$200–\$300 per hour per attorney, but noted uncertainty if this specific rate applies to the GRTF.

Chair Rodarte inquired about the process for hiring outside counsel. Assistant County Counsel Campos clarified that County Counsel controls all legal advice and litigation within the County and manages the retainer process for engaging outside counsel.

Member Hsieh inquired about the current appointment and reporting structure of County departments. Assistant County Counsel Bollinger explained that while departments are appointed by and report to the Board, they also report to the CEO regarding certain operational functions.

Interim Director Kardan provided a presentation on the Proposed Scope of Work on the focus areas.

Chair Rodarte and Member Neal inquired about the timeline for implementing Measure G. Interim Director Kardan responded that the GRTF has the flexibility to change the timeline, emphasizing that the current Scope of Work is only a proposal.

Member Hsieh and Member Sadhwani jointly inquired about staffing and budget details, emphasizing the need for the change to result in no increased cost and requesting access to detailed budget information. Interim Director Kardan responded that the CEO had been asked to present on the budget. Member Hsieh specifically voiced concerns regarding the impact of inflation and revenue adjustments of taxation. Member Sadhwani stressed the urgency of breaking down the budget details sooner and asked staff to identify who could attend the GRTF meetings to provide that specific budgetary breakdown.

Member Sadhwani asked about additional staffing for the GRTF and the staffing process. Interim Director Kardan explained that the GRTF can identify their specific needs, and the Executive Office would look into finding those resources. Member Sadhwani asked if the Executive Officer could attend the next meeting to give a report back on what that would look like. She also made a personal request for either a full-time staff or consultant who can help the GRTF understand the County's budget.

Chair Rodarte requested that the Executive Office provide a timeline for resources and the process for obtaining experts. Interim Director Kardan explained that a new process recently approved by the Board expedites the hiring of consultants. Member Yap voiced a call for greater transparency and consultation regarding staffing and budget information to effectively carry out its duties. She specifically requested that the committee be given an opportunity for input on the skill sets and to meet full-time staff candidates. Member Hsieh requested answers to questions regarding the staffing and budget and requested to have the Executive Officer attend a GRTF meeting. Member Green urged a shift from asking questions to proactive action, requesting the GRTF "create the answers" by immediately defining concrete staffing requirements, such as number, start date, and budget. Acknowledging current limitations, he stressed the need to stop "treading water," requesting marching orders so he could advocate for the necessary budget and decisively move the process forward.

Interim Director Kardan expressed concerns that the topic of the staffing process was not agendaized, and therefore she was unprepared to answer specific questions and added that it could be placed on the next meeting agenda, to allow the Executive Office to be prepared to answer these questions. Chair Rodarte stated that was fair and that he would work with Interim Director Kardan to place the topic on the next meeting agenda.

Member Gironas stated that they appreciate their colleagues expressing their needs but added that they all hold an accountability to each other – that they have personally been disappointed when GRTF members are not showing up to meetings, not reading notes, not responding to emails, amongst other things and that transparency and empowerment go both ways. Member Gironas expressed that in moments, they don't feel empowered to work with other members. Member Gironas also added that the information discussed today has been available on the Measure G website from the beginning and that after today, there should be no excuse for the work at hand.

3 members of the public virtually addressed the Governance Reform Task Force on this item.

**Attachments:**    [Ordinance](#)  
                              [Board Motion](#)  
                              [County Counsel Presentation](#)  
                              [Proposed Scope of Work with Timelines](#)  
                              [Staff Report](#)

#### 4. Discussion and Presentation by Ethics Experts

---

Presenters:

- Robert Stern, Commissioner on the City of Los Angeles Ethics Commission, first General Counsel of the California Fair Political Practices Commission-FPPC (1975-83) and principal co-author of the Political Reform Act of 1974, which established the FPPC
- Kathay Feng, Senior Deputy, Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, and former Executive Director of California Common Cause

**Commissioner Stern offered his views on the proposed structure and operational independence needed for establishing an Independent County Ethics Commission, drawing on his experience with the FPPC and LA City Ethics Commission. Commissioner Stern detailed key recommendations, including appointing 5 to 7 independent commissioners with staggered six-year terms, granting the Commission authority to hire its own staff and attorneys, and an implementation timeline. Commissioner Stern also indicated that it appears unusual to have both an Ethics Commission and an Ethics Compliance Office.**

**Senior Deputy Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RR/CC) Feng presented an overview of campaign finance reporting and ethics, detailing the RR/CC's role in receiving filings, the agencies that file with the office, and the scope of Proposition B. She also outlined gaps in the current filing process. Senior Deputy Feng then listed several considerations for establishing an Ethics Commission and Ethics Compliance Office, including their reporting structure, potential workforce expansion, subpoena powers, commissioner term limits, and roles. She specifically suggested not aligning the Commissioners' terms with the Board of Supervisors' terms to prevent the appearance that Commissioners are serving at the pleasure of their appointing Member. Lastly, she indicated that the GRTF could potentially recommend whether the new Ethics Commission and Compliance Office should have oversight over approximately 140 local agencies, which would include entities like school, water, and health districts.**

**4 members of the public addressed the Governance Reform Task Force on this item: 3 virtually and 1 via written comment.**

**Attachments:** [Presentation](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Written Public Comment](#)

5. Update and Consideration of Potential Action: Active GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittees

Discussion and Potential Action: Report by the following GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittees on their progress and work plans:

- GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittee to Identify Speakers and Experts for Long-Term Goals
- GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Expansion of the Board
- GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Public Budget Presentations and Five-Day Posting Requirement for Non-Urgent Legislation

- GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Public Engagement Strategy
- GRTF Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Establishment of an Independent Ethics Commission

Member Sadhwani reported that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to Identify Speakers and Experts for Long-Term Goals identified several candidates for interviews and the subcommittee also plans to connect with counties utilizing a county manager position to gather best practices and lessons learned. Following this, Member Gironas encouraged members of the public to contact the GRTF with any helpful knowledge.

Member Phelps reported that the Expansion of the Board Subcommittee focused on research and information-gathering concerning staffing and resource allocation. The work involves interviewing current/former staff and academics and requesting a map overlay of the current disproportionate distribution of County resources and District field offices. While acknowledging that supervisors retain staffing discretion, the Subcommittee aims to offer recommendations for streamlining reorganization, collecting public feedback, and establishing a mentorship program between established and incoming Supervisors during the transition.

Member Hsieh reported that the Public Budget Presentations and Five-Day Posting Subcommittee modified its plan to produce a completed memorandum detailing three simplified budget recommendations. The key proposals are to standardize the budget process, make it more inclusive of stakeholders, and implement a two-year budget cycle. Member Hsieh emphasized the two-year cycle is potentially a no-new-cost item achieved by refocusing staff to support the other two recommendations. Member Mockridge expressed concerns regarding departments dependent on state and federal funding, noting that their budgets had been slashed and were largely beyond their control. She questioned how a two-year budget cycle could accommodate necessary adjustments for these departments.

Member Gironas reported that the Public Engagement Strategy Subcommittee outlined probing questions for the public to gather more targeted feedback. Member Gironas encouraged members of the public to submit answers via email to [info@measureg.lacounty.gov](mailto:info@measureg.lacounty.gov) and on the Measure G website.

Member Fasana reported that the Independent Ethics Commission Subcommittee interviewed Don Garcia with the Executive Office and Robert Campbell with Auditor-Controller regarding ethics and enforcement. He highlighted the challenge of consolidating various functions, particularly investigations and subpoena power, without limiting their authority. Member Gironas encouraged individuals and organizations specializing in ethics to submit recommendations and insights via email to [info@measureg.lacounty.gov](mailto:info@measureg.lacounty.gov).

2 members of the public virtually addressed the Governance Reform Task Force on this item.

**Attachments:** [Draft Recommendations by the Public Budget Presentations Ad Hoc Subcommittee](#)

[Update Report by the Public Engagement Strategy Ad Hoc Subcommittee](#)

[Update Report by the Establishment of an Independent Ethics Commission Ad Hoc Subcommittee](#)

[Staff Report](#)

### **III. MISCELLANEOUS**

6. Matters not on the posted agenda, to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Governance Reform Task Force, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Governance Reform Task Force subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

**Chair Rodarte announced adding staffing to the next agenda.**

**Member Fasana requested a follow-up on budget reports, specifically asking for them to be distributed via email or another method.**

**Member Gironas requested more frequent meetings.**

**Member Soto requested a report on a staffing plan that is based on the scope of work and addresses the urgent timeline.**

**Member Phelps inquired whether the GRTF had received a response from the Board regarding the GRTF letters. Chair Rodarte confirmed that Supervisor Horvath had acknowledged the GRTF letter during a previous Board meeting.**

### **IV. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

7. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Governance Reform Task Force on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Governance Reform Task Force.

**1 member of the public virtually addressed the Governance Reform Task Force.**

**Attachments:** [Public Comment/Written Correspondence](#)

### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

8. Adjournment of the September 24, 2025, Governance Reform Task Force meeting.

**Chair Rodarte adjourned the meeting at 9:44 pm.**