

EXECUTIVE OFFICE



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

EDWARD YEN
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1411 • www.bos.lacounty.gov

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS

HOLLY J. MITCHELL

LINDSEY P. HORVATH

JANICE HAHN

KATHRYN BARGER

March 18, 2026

TO: Governance Reform Task Force (GRTF)
Ad Hoc Committee

FROM: Edward Yen *Edward Yen*
Executive Officer

SUBJECT: MEASURE G 120-HOUR POSTING REQUIREMENT

In follow-up to the meeting with the Executive Office Board Services Division, attached for your review are three proposed operational options to support compliance with the Measure G requirement to publish Board of Supervisors meeting agendas at least 120 hours prior to the meeting. The options outline varying levels of impact to current agenda development timelines, departmental workflows, and the County's ability to address emerging or time-sensitive matters.

Thank you for your time and partnership, we appreciate having had the opportunity to meet with members of your committee. Please let me know if you have any questions.

EY:NL:mr

Attachment

c: Shadi Kardan



BACKGROUND

The Executive Officer has been delegated the responsibility and authority to provide for the holding of meetings of the Board of Supervisors¹ (Board), which includes the publishing of agendas. In accordance with Section 25 of the Rules of the Board of Supervisors (Board Rules)², the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors (EO) currently publishes its meeting agenda on the Wednesday preceding each Tuesday meeting. Any revisions and/or additions are issued via a Supplemental Agenda on Friday. This supplemental document includes both minor and substantive changes, as well as new motions exempt from the Cluster process.

Effective in 2026, Measure G extends the current posting requirement under the Ralph M. Brown Act (Brown Act)³ from 72 hours to 120 hours, meaning new items or motions must be posted by the 120-hour deadline. The EO's understanding of the intent of this provision is that our current practice of posting a Supplemental Agenda that includes additional items on Fridays is not compliant with the Measure G provision.

Although the major component of the 120-hour provision is associated with the publishing date/time of the agenda. The format of the agenda title plays a major role in the type of changes that occur on the Supplemental Agenda. Currently, agenda entries often range from a quarter page to several pages, including detailed summaries and numerous recommendations. While comprehensive, this level of detail creates significant administrative burden and complicates timely updates. Lengthy entries hinder public accessibility, as residents must navigate extensive documents to understand core actions. Moreover, verbose titles and descriptions increase the likelihood of errors and revisions, which then require supplemental postings or verbal corrections during meetings.

Adopting concise agenda titles and streamlined summaries will not only improve clarity for the public but also meet Brown Act³ requirements of not exceeding 20 words. Additionally, concise titles will reduce operational inefficiencies, minimize supplemental agenda updates, and strengthen compliance with transparency standards. It will also bring Los Angeles County into alignment with the best practices being utilized in other counties.

Our office has developed three options to modify current agenda publishing practices to comply with the 120-hour requirement of Measure G. Each option presented assumes the use of concise titles.

¹ See Charter of the County of Los Angeles Chapter 2.36.060

² See Rules of the Board of Supervisors

³ See Government Code section 54954.2

OPTION 1: SINGLE AGENDA PUBLICATION

Description: Publish one comprehensive agenda on Wednesday prior to the meeting and eliminate the Supplemental Agenda. Agenda titles will be concise (20 words or fewer) to meet Brown Act³ requirements and improve readability.

Impact

High Impact – This option represents a high operational and organizational impact as it eliminates the use of supplemental agendas and requires all agenda items to be finalized at least 120 hours prior to the meeting. Stakeholders would experience significantly reduced flexibility to respond to emerging issues, time-sensitive matters, or late developing policy needs. This approach may increase the likelihood of delayed actions or postponed decisions. It ensures high compliance certainty and predictability for the public but substantially changes current workflows and shortens coordination timelines across the county.



OPPORTUNITIES

- All items available by Wednesday evening, enabling earlier identification of held items and fostering greater public engagement.
- Increased review time for stakeholders and the public, enhancing transparency.
- Concise agenda titles improve clarity and reduce revisions during meetings.

CHALLENGES

- Potential increase in read-in motions during meetings due to lack of supplemental updates, which may lead to a lack of clarity on the intent of the motion. Board Rules Section 22² limits the number of read-in motions that each Board member can bring forward, an increase of read-in motions may directly challenge that rule.
- Risk of decreased transparency if substantive changes occur during the meeting.

OPTION 2: ADVANCE AGENDA AND SUPPLEMENTAL DEADLINES BY ONE WEEK

Description: Publish the regular agenda 10 days prior to the meeting (Friday) and the supplemental agenda 5 days prior (Wednesday).

Impact

Medium Impact – This option results in a medium operational impact by maintaining both regular and supplemental agendas while advancing internal submission deadlines by approximately one week to ensure compliance with the 120-hour publishing requirement. Departments would need to adjust planning cycles, internal approvals and executive review timelines earlier in the process. Although this option preserves flexibility to address emerging business through supplemental agendas, it may create scheduling challenges for departments managing complex items. At present, the majority of counties maintain the traditional agenda publishing model consistent with Brown Act compliance and have not adopted this alternative approach. Implementation would require workflow adjustment during a Board recess period.

OPPORTUNITIES

- Maintains flexibility for adding items post-initial posting while ensuring compliance.
- Consolidates late items into a formal supplemental document, improving operational efficiency.
- Reduces read-in revisions by allowing additional time for last-minute corrections.

CHALLENGES

- Requires advancing internal filing deadlines by one week (policy motions, Cluster meetings, etc.).



OPTION 3: RETAIN CURRENT PUBLISHING SCHEDULE WITH A “REVISIONS ONLY” SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

Description: Publish the regular agenda 6 days prior to the meeting (Wednesday) and the supplemental agenda 4 days prior (Friday). The supplemental agenda will be limited to include only revisions to items that were included on the regular agenda (no new items).

Impact

Low Impact – This option has a low operational impact as it largely preserves current publishing practices while limiting supplemental agendas to revisions or modifications of previously published items. Departments retain the existing workflow structure and timeline expectations, minimizing disruption to internal processes. However, the ability to introduce entirely new items after the initial agenda has been published would be restricted, potentially delaying certain matters to future agendas. This approach balances compliance with the 120-hour rule while maintaining operational continuity.

OPPORTUNITIES

- No operational changes to internal deadlines or processes.
- Maintains flexibility for revising agenda titles that may need correction.

CHALLENGES

- May increase new read-in motions.
- Potential increase in read-in motions during meetings due to lack of supplemental updates, which may lead to a lack of clarity on the intent of the motion. Board Rules Section 22² limits the number of read-in motions that each Board member can bring forward, an increase of read-in motions may directly challenge that rule.
- Risk of decreased transparency if substantive changes occur during the meeting.
- May not meet the spirit/intent of the Measure G 120-hour rule.

RECOMMENDATION

Board Operations recommends Option 2: Advance agenda and supplemental deadlines by one week. This approach minimizes operational disruption, ensures compliance, and strengthens public engagement. To mitigate risks of verbal changes during meetings, we propose formal procedures for held items, including submission deadlines, requirement for written motions from Board offices, and adoption of concise agenda titles for both options to improve clarity and reduce supplemental entries.

To effectively meet the requirements of Measure G, it is essential that all options incorporate more comprehensive Board Rules. These rules should not only provide clarity during Board meetings but also empower the EO to initiate and enforce procedures and deadlines to carry out the provisions. This approach will enhance operational efficiency, promote transparency and encourage public engagement, ensuring that the Board operates effectively and remains accountable to the community.



GRTF

120-HOUR COMPLIANCE OPTIONS

KEY BENEFITS OF RECOMMENDED APPROACH

- Transparency: Extended review periods for stakeholders and the public.
- Public Engagement: Clearer agendas and predictable timelines.
- Operational Efficiency: Structured processes for revisions and supplemental postings.