COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Council File 26-0675
Executive Directives / Council Oversight Role / November 2026 Ballot

Received Thursday, November 19, 2026
57 comments

Comment 1 of 57

Brittany Villalpando • November 19, 2026 at 12:29 AM

Hello!

I am a resident in the Pacoima area and I would like to express my disapproval of this proposed change. I don’t agree with limiting the mayor’s executive powers and abilities. There are already plenty of hurdles to bring change, we don’t need any more.
I urge you to please hear us out and support the concerns of your constituents.
Thank you

Comment 2 of 57

Derek Mamrol • November 19, 2026 at 12:45 AM

Further weakening the already weak executive authority of the LA mayor is exactly the opposite of what the city should be doing at a time when the city government is struggling to deliver basic services to its constituents. The sudden re-visiting of this motion after this mayoral election appears politically motivated and the people of LA will not stand for a government more focused on maintaining the status quo than delivering for its constituents.

Comment 3 of 57

Vedant Patel • November 19, 2026 at 1:04 AM

To the members of the LA City Council,

I strongly urge you to vote against the motion set out by Council File 26-0675. The mayor's executive directives should not be under threat of being overturned. We, as Los Angeles residents, made our voices clear in this election about our desire for change in how this city is governed and what it prioritizes, as shown by the comfortable victory of mayor-elect Raman. Council File 26-0675 is, quite frankly, a slap in the face to the vast majority of Angelenos who want to see the new mayor have the power to push forward positive policies and enforce them quickly and effectively. In fact, this proposed change would be blatantly anti-democratic and subvert the will of the voters by trying to kneecap the very clear message we have sent at the ballot box.

Please vote no on this motion so Los Angeles does not continue on the path of decline and distrust in the city's political institutions (the City Council being at the core of this unpopularity) caused by incessant, internal government bureaucracy and its inability to actually enforce any laws and directives actually passed, all of which have stymied any attempts to change our downward trajectory up until now.

Comment 4 of 57

Matthew MacDonald • November 19, 2026 at 1:15 AM

any council member voting in favor of this completely unethical power grab will never get my vote in the future. we have seen how little is accomplished by an overpowered city council. la city council has been particularly rife with fraud. if anything we should be creating a strong mayoral system that gives the mayor more power as it has enabled mamdani to enact real change that is constantly improving the lives of new yorkers. LA deserves the same. This proposal and anyone who votes in favor of it clearly does not want what is best for the residents of los angeles.

Comment 5 of 57

Eric Prah • November 19, 2026 at 1:16 AM

The people of LA made their voices heard by voting for Nithya Raman as mayor. Now just before she takes office, the city council is considering two separate proposals to preemptively reduce the mayor’s power and to expand their own power within LA’s government. This kind of underhanded power grabbing is not only disrespectful to your constituents, but to the entire democratic process. Please vote no on 26-0675 and 26-0703, and preserve Raman’s ability to do what she was elected to do.

Comment 6 of 57

Wes Chuang • November 19, 2026 at 2:04 AM

Vote no! Do not limit the next mayor's power. We need a car-independent and affordable L.A. under mayor-elect Nithya Raman's leadership.

Comment 7 of 57

P. Kedilaya • November 19, 2026 at 2:32 AM

I am writing to formally oppose Agenda Item 19 (Council File 26-0675). Allowing a two-thirds Council vote to modify or overturn Mayoral Executive Directives blurs accountability and slows down urgent city operations. Bypassing Charter Review Committee on major governance changes is inappropriate. Please vote NO on Item 19 and allow the Charter Review Committee to evaluate this through its public process.

Comment 8 of 57

Breshaun Rucker • November 19, 2026 at 2:53 AM

I am a Los Angeles resident and District 5 constituent, and I strongly oppose both Items 19 and 20.

I urge the City Council to vote NO on both proposals.

I am deeply concerned about expanding the City Council’s authority to overturn mayoral executive directives and remove department leadership. These proposals raise significant questions about the balance of power, accountability, political interference, and the stability of

city government.

Los Angeles needs a government built on transparency, accountability, and effective leadership. The distinct responsibilities of the Mayor and City Council serve an important purpose in maintaining checks and balances. Expanding the Council's authority in these areas risks creating an environment where administrative decisions and departmental leadership become increasingly subject to political maneuvering.

Changes to the City's Charter should never be treated as routine procedural matters. They have lasting implications for how our city is governed and deserve meaningful public scrutiny and consideration.

As a resident and taxpayer, I expect my elected representatives to prioritize the long-term interests of Los Angeles residents rather than advance changes that could concentrate additional political power.

I strongly urge the Council to reject Item 19 (CF 26-0675) and Item 20 (CF 26-0703).

My position is clear: Vote NO on both items.

Comment 9 of 57

John Sutter • November 19, 2026 at 3:12 AM

I am a strong supporter of both CF 26-0703 and CF 26-0675.

Some people wrongly conclude that Nithya Raman is the target of these power-balancing motions. But they were both introduced long before her election, and do not target her.

Having checks and balances on the Mayor makes perfectly good sense. Just like the Mayor can veto the City Council, the City Council should be able to veto the Mayor. This doesn't reduce the power of the Mayor, it protects the City. A two-thirds super majority of the City Council is a difficult bar to cross, and if that many elected representatives feel it is necessary to reverse an action, then it's probably the best thing for the city.

I urge you to vote yes on Items 19 and 20 at your November 20, 2026 meeting.

Comment 10 of 57

Bruce Krysiak • November 19, 2026 at 5:27 AM

I feel like a more substantial public analysis of the effects of this proposal is required before allowing it to move forward.

I can understand the idea, and also it does feel like giving the mayor more executive autonomy can make citywide decisions more coherent and make it easier for voters to identify who is responsible for results, two things that have felt lacking in my experience of LA oversight in my 25 years here.

Facilitating potential political gridlock feels like a step backwards, but without more insightful consideration I would oppose this motion.

Key issues are things like:

- Must an independent report or public hearing precede an override?
- Does the mayor get an opportunity to respond?
- Can departments continue implementing directives while a challenge is pending?
- Can Council overturn or rewrite directives, or just comment on them?

...all of which require time to consider and recommend with thoughtful diligence, not slapdash haste. Please reject this proposal until it is more fully baked.

Comment 11 of 57

Emma Lemcke • November 19, 2026 at 7:01 AM

Your actions define you. This effort to limit Mayoral power will be remembered and it will not ultimately be successful. The votes were counted; you should respect the will of the people. Monica Rodriguez, this is a shameful move. You do not represent your voters with honor.

Comment 12 of 57

David Eaton • November 19, 2026 at 7:02 AM

Let’s not do this blatant power grab! This is outrageous. Let the new mayor try

---

Comment 13 of 57

Veronica Doering • November 19, 2026 at 7:14 AM

I strongly oppose the proposed Charter amendment that would allow the City Council to override the Mayor’s executive directives.

Los Angeles already operates under a system in which mayoral authority is significantly constrained compared with that of strong-mayor cities such as New York. Further weakening the executive branch is not the answer to improving city government.

The City Council already exercises substantial legislative and budgetary authority. Giving it the additional power to overturn executive directives risks further blurring the separation of powers, creating administrative gridlock, and making it increasingly difficult to hold anyone accountable for the City’s performance.

Residents elect a mayor to provide citywide leadership, establish priorities, and execute policy. If the Council can continually intervene in executive decisions, who is ultimately responsible when those policies fail?

Checks and balances are essential, but so is an effective executive branch. Los Angeles needs clearer accountability, more efficient government, and decisive leadership—not another layer of political interference.

I urge the City Council to reject this proposal and preserve the independence and authority of the Mayor’s office, regardless of who occupies it.

This is about sound governance, not personalities or political affiliations.

Comment 14 of 57

Charles Thomson • November 19, 2026 at 7:44 AM

I live in Highland Park, Los Angeles 90042. I'm writing to ask you to vote no on this proposed Charter amendment. Council File 26-0675 would allow two-thirds of the Council to change or overturn the Mayor's executive directives. This proposals would make it harder for the incoming mayor to carry out the job voters elected her to do and harder for residents to know who is accountable for the results. This is against the will of the people who voted for Nithya Raman to make change.

Comment 15 of 57

Jax • November 19, 2026 at 7:55 AM

The mayor should remain in charge

Comment 16 of 57

Mike Che • November 19, 2026 at 7:59 AM

Please vote NO on Items 19 and 20. LA has been mired in disfunction for years. We need to allow the Mayor to have power to make change. People voted Nithya into office. Let her have a chance to show what she can do.

Comment 17 of 57

Paul • November 19, 2026 at 8:29 AM

Why is it that anything limiting the Council takes years and years of study, but limiting the Mayor (thereby granting the Council even more power) can be put to a vote immediately with no question or discussion?

Comment 18 of 57

Ekatherina Buday • November 19, 2026 at 8:33 AM

Vote NO on this motion. This is undemocratic and unacceptable.

Comment 19 of 57

Josh Saltsman • November 19, 2026 at 8:35 AM

This is a bad idea and I am strongly against it. We do not need more authority moved away from the mayor and into the city council.

Comment 20 of 57

Kari M. • November 19, 2026 at 8:38 AM

As a resident of CD1, I strongly oppose Items 19 and 20 and urge all councilmembers to vote against them. Nithya Raman won the city's vote for mayor and the city council should support that decision instead of trying to undermine the effectiveness of that position.

Comment 21 of 57

Richard • November 19, 2026 at 8:55 AM

Motions 26-0675 and 26-0703 are a solution without a problem. There are no examples of when the city needed these powers but didn't have them. As such, the only reasonable conclusion is that it is an attempt to weaken the mayor when the city council does not agree with the people's choice for that position and to grab power for itself. It is embarrassing that the council would even attempt this and tells me that the it shouldn't have this power. I hope that the council will do the right thing and vote both 26-0675 and 26-0703 down. The people deserve to have their voices heard and these motions are in direct opposition to that.

Richard, 90025 resident

Comment 22 of 57

Adam Aguirre • November 19, 2026 at 8:58 AM

The people voted for the mayor and want them to be able to change the city for the better. These motions do the opposite. I demand a no vote for the items that will prevent the incoming mayor from enacting their agenda. How dare you try and weaken this mayor.

Comment 23 of 57

Jairi Sanchez • November 19, 2026 at 9:12 AM

Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and members of the Los Angeles City Council,

I am a resident of Vermont Vista, Los Angeles, 90044. I am writing to ask that you vote no on Items 19 (Council File 26-0675) and 20 (Council File 26-0703). Together, these two proposals would make it harder for the incoming Mayor to deliver on the campaign promises she made to voters. The mayor of the City of Los Angeles already has limited powers compared to those in cities like New York City, and cutting them even further is a travesty.

Los Angeles voters approved Amendment EE on the November 3, 2026 ballot, which changes the City Charter requirement from holding regular meetings at least three days a week to meeting "at least weekly," allowing the Council to reduce required meetings to one day per week. This is concerning because the City of Los Angeles has 44 general managers, and Council File 26-0703 would allow two-thirds of the Council to remove a general manager or department head. How are you supposed to do this for 44 people in one meeting? At least in the past, you had three meetings a week; now you will soon have only one? Seriously??

How about you focus your meetings on what really matters to our city—infrastructure, LADWP, and other items—instead of the petty wars over firing general managers you like? As someone who lives very near the Figueroa corridor, I would prefer it if Mr. Harris Dawson focused more on the prostitution that my two sons and niece, who are all under 10 years old, see every day.

"No Right Turn" signs are posted after 8:00 p.m. (and during late-night hours), and they are concentrated along residential side streets in the South Los Angeles Figueroa Corridor—particularly between Gage Avenue and Century Boulevard (roughly 60th Street through 100th+ Street). However, beyond 100th, where I live, cars turn at all hours of the day. That is where I would like my Councilmember to focus, not on voting to remove general managers.

As someone who voted for the new mayor, I want her to have the power to issue executive directives and remove general managers if she feels they are ineffective. That is what I did when I voted for Mayor Karen Bass in the last election, and that is what I want from our new mayor, Nythia Raman.

Thank you,
Jairi Sanchez
Vermont Vista, Los Angeles 90044

Comment 24 of 57

Angela Heine • November 19, 2026 at 9:42 AM

I do not support this and wish for the city council to vote no. We elected Nithya Raman because of wanting specific changes to be addressed in Los Angeles. Taking away her ability to do those things takes away our vote. Thanks.

Comment 25 of 57

Christopher Ray • November 19, 2026 at 9:54 AM

I oppose this motion. The city council already has too much power over the mayor. This will only further weaken a mayoral office that is already took weak.

Comment 26 of 57

Jacob Pierce • November 19, 2026 at 10:03 AM

Abundant Housing LA urges you to vote NO on items CF 26-0675 and CF 26-0703 (items 19 and 20, respectively on the Nov. 20 City Council agenda). Just last week, council members congratulated Mayor-Elect Raman in chambers and committed to working with her on reforms that will benefit the city’s residents. But now, two charter amendment motions have been placed on the 11/20 council agenda that would diminish the Mayor-Elect’s ability to drive the change voters demanded. Please reject both of these efforts.

Attachment: AHLA Opposition to 26-0675, 26-0703.pdf (PDF, 191 KB). Posted separately to this Council file.

Comment 27 of 57

Elizabeth Diaz • November 19, 2026 at 10:06 AM

I strongly urge the Los Angeles City Council to vote NO on Item 19, Council File 26-0675, which would give the Council the power to overturn the mayor's executive directives with a two-thirds vote. The City Council already has significant authority over legislation, budgeting, and city policies, and giving itself additional control over executive decisions would further blur the

separation of powers.

Los Angeles is already struggling with homelessness, affordable housing, and the delivery of basic city services, and this proposal could create more political gridlock when the city needs decisive leadership. Allowing 10 councilmembers to overturn mayoral directives could also undermine the authority of a mayor elected by voters citywide and make it harder for residents to hold anyone accountable when policies fail.

Councilmember Eunisses Hernandez, I voted for you because your values aligned with mine and my community's, and I would be extremely disappointed if you supported this expansion of Council power instead of respecting the balance of authority in our city government.

Comment 28 of 57

Brian Dang • November 19, 2026 at 10:19 AM

I am a constituent of District 13. Hugo, I know you loved working for Bass so much since you overwhelmingly supported her campaign, but the people have spoken! We wanted Nithya for mayor and to pull such a shady move to remove her power before she starts is ridiculous. We urge you to not let this item pass and support your constituents' decisions. We also have the power to remove you from city council when the time comes as well and will remember this.

Comment 29 of 57

Mike C • November 19, 2026 at 10:32 AM

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Council File 26-0675 (Rodriguez–McOsker) and Council File 26-0703 (Jurado–Blumenfield), both of which propose significant changes to the City's Charter and the balance of authority within Los Angeles city government.

I urge every Council Member to vote NO on both proposals.

Los Angeles has an elected Mayor for a reason. The Mayor serves as the City's chief executive officer and is responsible for providing executive leadership, establishing administrative priorities, directing city operations, and ensuring that departments are working toward the needs of Angelenos.

The City Council's responsibility is to legislate, establish policy, approve budgets, conduct oversight, and hold city government accountable. It should not extend into taking control of the City's executive operations.

We cannot expect a city to function effectively when executive authority is divided among competing political interests.

Council File 26-0675 raises serious concerns by proposing to give a two-thirds majority of the Council the authority to overturn executive directives issued by the Mayor. This risks undermining the Mayor's ability to establish and carry out a consistent administrative direction.

Council File 26-0703 is equally concerning. Allowing Council Members to remove General Managers or Department Heads through a two-thirds vote creates another layer of political influence over executive appointments and departmental leadership. Department heads should

be accountable through an established executive management structure, not subject to political pressure or shifting alliances within the Council.

The City Council is not the City's executive management team. The Mayor is not simply another vote on the Council. These are separate responsibilities, and that separation matters.

A personal perspective from an Angeleno

I reside in the City of Los Angeles, and my Council representative is Maurice. I also commute outside the city to work for the County of Orange. Through that experience, I have the opportunity to see how another local government operates and how its communities approach public services, administration, and quality of life.

Is Orange County perfect? Absolutely not. Its cities have their own challenges, problems, and areas that need improvement. However, from my perspective, there are things Los Angeles could learn from the way other local governments approach leadership, accountability, and city services.

It is frustrating to live in a city with so much potential and continuously see residents struggle with the cost of living, homelessness, public safety concerns, deteriorating infrastructure, and the overall quality of our neighborhoods.

Angelenos should not have to leave their own city to find a better quality of life.

We need to make Los Angeles more affordable. We need policies that allow working residents and families to afford to live here, maintain their homes, support local businesses, and feel safe in their neighborhoods. We need a city government focused on delivering results rather than creating additional political power struggles.

I want to see Los Angeles become a city that people are proud to live in again—not a city where residents feel they are constantly paying more while receiving less in return.

A message to City Hall

And let me make one thing absolutely clear: Angelenos are not afraid to mobilize, organize, and exercise their democratic power.

The recent election demonstrated that voters are paying attention and are willing to make their voices heard at the ballot box. No elected official should ever assume that their position is untouchable.

If Council Members choose to put political interests ahead of the people they were elected to represent, Angelenos are fully capable of organizing recall campaigns and pursuing every lawful avenue to hold their elected representatives accountable.

Public office is a privilege, NOT a permanent entitlement. Your position belongs to the people, and your responsibility is to serve them.

We are awake, we are paying attention, and we are ready to take our city back!

I respectfully but firmly demand that each Council Member reject both proposals and vote NO on Council Files 26-0675 and 26-0703.

Los Angeles needs leadership, accountability, affordability, and an effective chain of command—not a government where everyone wants to be CEO.

The people are watching. Make the right decision.

Sincerely,

A Concerned Angeleno

Comment 30 of 57

Paul Lee • November 19, 2026 at 10:39 AM

I am a Los Angeles resident in council district 10 and i oppose countil files 26-0675 and 26-0703.
These charter amendments would let the council overturn the mayor's executive directive and remove general managers and department heads by a two thirds vote. Voters just elected a new mayor who has yet to take office. Shifting this executive authority to the council in the final weeks of Karen Bass' administration directly undercuts the result of the people's vote.

Changes this significant to the city's balance of power deserve a full public process. Both of these items skipped consideration by the Ad Hoc committee on Charter review, and no community impact statements have been submitted. I urge the council to vote no, or to postpone both items until after the new mayor has been sworn in so the public has an opportunity to weigh in.

Comment 31 of 57

Javier Lopez Jr • November 19, 2026 at 10:47 AM

I live in CD1. I will do everything in my power to remove Eunisses Hernandez if she votes for this.

Comment 32 of 57

Christine Marie Harris • November 19, 2026 at 10:55 AM

The Los Angeles City Council's attempt to reduce the mayor's authority just two weeks after Nithya Raman defeated incumbent Karen Bass raises serious questions about democratic accountability, political retaliation, and respect for the voters. Democracy isn't simply about allowing people to vote. It is also about respecting the consequences of their votes. An election is supposed to give voters a meaningful opportunity to change the direction of government. When elected officials respond to an unexpected election result by attempting to change the powers of the winning office, they risk undermining that principle. The danger is especially serious when those changes are rushed through without meaningful public participation. This creates an appearance of institutional self-protection at the expense of democratic accountability.

The Council should postpone tomorrow's consideration until the proposals have received proper public scrutiny. LA City constituents deserve a full public explanation of why these changes are necessary, a transparent review of their consequences for city governance, and meaningful opportunities for public participation before the Council advances them. Fundamental changes to the structure of government should be developed through a transparent, deliberative process —not rushed forward immediately after an election that produced a result many Councilmembers opposed. If Councilmembers genuinely believe these changes are necessary for Los Angeles, they should be willing to defend them through a thorough public process. And they should be able to explain why the proposals are so urgent that they cannot wait until the incoming mayor has even taken office.

Comment 33 of 57

Mark Weathers • November 19, 2026 at 11:05 AM

No! If you vote against this I will do everything in my power to have you removed from office

Comment 34 of 57

Kristen • November 19, 2026 at 11:22 AM

Angelenos came out in overwhelming numbers and voted for a new mayor for a reason. We will do the same thing and vote out corrupt City Councilmembers that try to pass this. I urge all of the Council to oppose items 19 and 20. I would hope that our City Council would accept the election results and focus on improving the city instead of attempting such a desperate and embarrassing power grab.

Comment 35 of 57

Nina Eliasoph • November 19, 2026 at 11:45 AM

Please don't vote to limit the mayor's power!. Nithya Raman won the vote by over 9% because we liked what she wanted to do. Limiting the mayor's power now is just sleazy, anti-democratic maneuvering to prevent her from doing what we voters want.

I am in Hugo Soto-Martinez' district: 3406 La Clede. Hugo, I canvassed for you. Do the right thing: Don't obey the corporate Democrats. Don't vote to limit Nithya's power.

Comment 36 of 57

Marina Del Rey Resident • November 19, 2026 at 12:24 PM

Subject: Opposition to Council Files 26-0675 and 26-0703 (Charter Amendments)

Dear Councilmember,

I live in Marina del Rey, and decisions made by this Council affect my community. I am writing to oppose two proposed Charter amendments:

1. Council File 26-0675, Executive Directives / Council Oversight Role (Rodriguez, McOsker). This would amend the Charter so a two-thirds vote of the Council could change or overturn

Executive Directives issued by the Mayor.

2. Council File 26-0703, General Manager Removal / Charter Section 575(e) (Jurado, Blumenfield). This would amend the Charter so a two-thirds vote of the Council could remove any General Manager or Department Head of a City Department, Office, or Board.

City voters just elected a new mayor. Together, these measures would let the Council reverse that mayor's directives and remove the department heads the mayor chooses. That moves executive authority away from the official voters chose to run the city.

The Council already has strong checks. It confirms the mayor's general manager appointments, controls the budget, and passes the laws departments carry out. Adding the power to overturn directives and fire department leaders blurs who is accountable when things go right or wrong.

Neither file has a Community Impact Statement, and the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Review waived consideration of both. Changes to the balance of power in the Charter deserve full public review, not a fast track.

I urge you not to place CF 26-0675 or CF 26-0703 on a future ballot, and to let the incoming administration govern with the authority voters gave it.

Respectfully,
A Marina del Rey resident

Comment 37 of 57

Ben Glickstein • November 19, 2026 at 12:41 PM

I'm writing as an Echo Park resident and constituent to urge you to vote against items 19 and 20 at Friday's City Council meeting.

It's deeply troubling that, within weeks of Angelenos electing Nithya Raman as their next mayor, the Council is suddenly prioritizing charter amendments that would substantially undermine her executive authority.

While these motions predate the election, the timing of their advancement and the decision to bypass further committee review make this look less like good governance and more like a blatant power grab.

Angelenos voted for a change in leadership and direction at City Hall. Attempting to diminish the authority of the mayor's office before our newly elected mayor has even been sworn in strikes me as fundamentally disrespectful to the electorate.

I am all for meaningful charter reform, greater transparency and accountability at City Hall. But those principles should apply equally to the City Council itself.

Los Angeles needs functional government, not institutional turf wars.

I urge you to publicly oppose both motions and respect the mandate voters have given our incoming mayor. I would also appreciate hearing your position on these proposals.

Best,

Benjamin Glickstein
Echo Park, CD13

Comment 38 of 57

Marlene Esquivel • November 19, 2026 at 12:44 PM

Please vote NO on this directive. And send it back to the ad hoc committee where it should be.

Comment 39 of 57

amanda anderson • November 19, 2026 at 12:48 PM

We just voted in a new mayor. Now is not the time to be enacting new rules about your ability to reverse changes made by the new mayor. We're looking for action and change. This sudden sense of urgency to allow yourselves the ability to thwart this possibility draws your interests into question. Vote NO. We want change.

Comment 40 of 57

Austin Si • November 19, 2026 at 12:50 PM

My name is Austin Si with UAW 4811, and I'm a Graduate Student Researcher from Council District 5.

I have been living in LA for the last few years as I have been attending UCLA for school/work. I take the bus to work every day and walk around Westwood and Palms often. I was very excited about Nithya's mayoral campaign because she highlighted reducing homelessness and improving public transit as major parts of her plan to improve LA as mayor. These would help make my life better by improving safety on the streets and making it easier to get around all of LA. However, these proposed charter amendments seem like they would make the enacting of these changes more difficult for the mayor.

I am concerned that we are rushing the approval of charter amendments that would have a significant impact on the Mayor's powers without proper administrative or community review. I also question why the Ad-Hoc Committee on Charter Review waived consideration of these without any substantive discussion. For such significant reforms, I would have expected that the Committee spend time thoroughly weighing the benefits and drawbacks these reforms would have. Further, since these would end up on the 2028 ballot, it does not make sense that we are moving so quickly if we can accomplish the same outcome after a thorough review.

I and many others voted for Nithya because we want change here in LA. Pushing these amendments through now would feel like a slap in the face to those of us hoping for more out of our city. I am encouraging City Council to vote no on items #19 and #20 and send them back to the Ad-Hoc Committee on Charter Reform for substantive review and discussion, instead of haphazardly pushing significant reforms to the 2028 ballot.

Thank you,
Austin Si

Comment 41 of 57

Laura Cowan • November 19, 2026 at 12:53 PM

Dear Hugo & other council members

Please vote no tomorrow on

The Council File numbers are 26-0675 for Item 19 & 26-0703 for Item 20

These items are designed weaken our newly elected mayor before she is even in office. These items weaken the Mayor's office via two charter reforms

• Allow city council to remove the mayor's dept. general managers with a 2/3rds vote

• Allow city council to overturn or change the Mayor's Executive Directives

Voters overwhelmingly voted for change in the mayoral election, we want more than the corrupt, pro-business, pro-NYMBY business as usual from both our mayor's office & from you. I voted for you both times because I believe you can continue to help change things

Honestly this seems like sour grapes from leaders who wanted a 2nd term for Mayor Bass instead of actual, necessary charter reform, which we really do need

Please vote no tomorrow on these items

Laura Cowan
Homeowner & Business owner in Atwater Village, CD-13

Comment 42 of 57

Mallory Moore • November 19, 2026 at 12:57 PM

As a constituent of CD8, I can see that this is an abhorrent abuse of power by the City Council, happening conveniently at the time a new Mayor will take office. This reform is a clear power grab by those sitting comfortably in their seats--for now--against an obviously popular incoming leader. There is strong disdain for this reform among the constituents these council members are supposed to represent who, again, clearly chose a new mayor to lead their city. Rushing through this reform is an embarrassing attempt to undermine democracy and the voices of Angelenos. What an immature, childish way to silence the people the council is supposed to serve, people who rightfully exercised their powers this November to push for change.

Comment 43 of 57

Jeffrey Alan Miller • November 19, 2026 at 12:58 PM

Comment on Items 19 and 20 (CF 26-0675 and CF 26-0703)

I oppose both items.

A Mayor is entitled to run the administration as she sees fit, with the personnel she sees fit. A department director operates under the Mayor and reports to the Mayor. It is anomalous for a director to hold office over the Mayor's objection, and equally anomalous for the Council to remove a director the Mayor wants, for any reason or no reason.

Item 20 would create the second anomaly in general form. The Charter today contains only a narrow version of the first: under Section 508, a general manager the Mayor has removed may appeal to the Council, and the Council may reinstate the manager by a two-thirds vote. That power is defensive, and it was granted deliberately. Item 20 would add the offensive power — initiation — and it changes the character of every director's service. A director who can be removed by the Council serves two masters.

Item 19 is not needed to check a directive the Council believes is wrong. Under Section 231(j), an executive directive binds the departments only "in the absence of conflicting provisions in the Charter or ordinance." The Council holds the legislative power. If it enacts an ordinance that conflicts with a directive, the ordinance prevails; and if the Mayor vetoes the ordinance, overriding the veto takes the same two-thirds vote — 10 of 15 — that Item 19 would require. The Council also confirms every general manager before he or she takes office, may itself initiate removal proceedings against the Chief of Police under Section 575, and controls the budget. The Council is not without recourse today.

If a Council removal power is ever adopted, it should be confined to serious dereliction of duty. Removing a department head is a major undertaking and should not become a routine instrument of policy disagreement.

Finally, there is no reason to act on Friday. These are charter amendments and require a vote of the people. The November 2026 ballot they were drafted for has passed, and they cannot reach the voters before 2028. Measures that cannot take effect for over two years should go through the ordinary deliberative charter reform process, not be rushed through with committee review waived.

Jeffrey Alan Miller
Los Feliz, Council District 4

Comment 44 of 57

Betty Doumas-Toto • November 19, 2026 at 1:06 PM

I urge the city council to oppose this proposal. n a time where we need more flexibility to address the urgent needs of Angelenos the city council wants to add another layer of bureaucracy. The city and the mayor need to be at the ready when it comes to rapid response to attacks on our immigrant community and to the housing crisis. Adding delays will not lead to progress. Oppose this proposal 26-0675

Comment 45 of 57

Ben B McShane • November 19, 2026 at 1:10 PM

Do not pass this item. Los Angeles voted for Mayor Raman to execute her agenda. We do not need a City Council captured by renters and developers to undermine Mayor Raman's authority.

Comment 46 of 57

Dimitra Skouras • November 19, 2026 at 1:13 PM

My name is Dimitra, and I live in Council district 10.

I've spent the past few months canvassing and volunteering in my community, and seen firsthand the changes that community members are desiring. They want affordable housing and healthcare. They want safer, cleaner streets. They want accessible parks, they want streetlights. Our community is unsatisfied with the status quo, and the mayoral election results clearly reflect that desire.

I am concerned that we are rushing the approval of charter amendments that would have a significant impact on the Mayor's powers without proper administrative or community review. I also question why the Ad-Hoc Committee on Charter Review waived consideration of these without any substantive discussion. For such significant reforms, I would have expected that the Committee spend time thoroughly weighing the benefits and drawbacks these reforms would have. Further, since these would end up on the 2028 ballot, it does not make sense that we are moving so quickly if we can accomplish the same outcome after a thorough review.

I am encouraging City Council to vote no on items #19 and #20 and send them back to the Ad-Hoc Committee on Charter Reform for substantive review and discussion, instead of haphazardly pushing significant reforms to the 2028 ballot.

Thank you,
Dimitra Skouras

Comment 47 of 57

Yolanda Mack • November 19, 2026 at 1:15 PM

I'm a Council District 3 resident in Reseda, and I oppose Item 19. Letting a two-thirds council vote overturn the mayor's executive directives would weaken the mayor voters just elected, weeks before she takes office. This motion skipped committee review, and no community impact statements have been filed. A change this big to how the city is run deserves a full public process, not a rushed vote during a transition. Please vote NO.

Yolanda Mack, Reseda

Comment 48 of 57

Bryan Bernart • November 19, 2026 at 1:17 PM

This motion hands unearned power to the City Council. I strongly urge you to vote no and to remember that you serve at the pleasure of your constituents, who elected Nithya Raman as an agent of change and are counting on her using the authority of the office to serve the working people of Los Angeles.

Comment 49 of 57

Doris Lemieux • November 19, 2026 at 1:18 PM

Vote No on CF #26-0675 and #26-0703. Do not override the power of the mayor. Keep the balance of power.

Comment 50 of 57

S. King • November 19, 2026 at 1:36 PM

I'm a CD5 resident in vehement opposition to this motion. This reads like a last-ditch effort to restrict the Mayor-elect's authority after a legitimate election win. The lack of discussion in Committee is undemocratic, as is this attempt to expand the power of City Council without a popular vote. Any reform like this should be subject to as much scrutiny and debate as the delayed Charter reforms. I call on all Councilmembers to reject this motion to preserve the integrity of LA City government.

Comment 51 of 57

Michael Evan James Hopson • November 19, 2026 at 1:39 PM

Good afternoon. My name is Michael Hopson. I’m with BLMLA and an organizer in Council District 5.

As a Black, queer Angeleno living in Koreatown, I see the difficult conditions that many people across our city are living under.

I am concerned that the City is rushing to approve charter amendments that could significantly expand the Mayor’s powers without adequate administrative or community review. I also question why the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Reform waived consideration of these proposals without substantive public discussion.

Reforms of this magnitude require a transparent process that thoroughly examines their potential benefits, risks, and long-term consequences. Since these measures would not appear on the ballot until 2028, there is no justification for rushing them forward now when the Council has time to conduct a meaningful review.

I urge the City Council to vote no on Items 19 and 20 and send them back to the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Reform for substantive review, public input, and discussion. Significant reforms should not be haphazardly pushed onto the 2028 ballot.

Thank you.

Comment 52 of 57

Cameron Colony • November 19, 2026 at 1:44 PM

This is an deeply unacceptable last minute power grab and an affront to the will of the voters. City council shouldn't be focused on locking in our existing system, because it's fundamentally broken in favor of the corrupt. Just because conservative city councilors fear change does not mean they get to change the rules at the last minute because their mayor lost. Corruption in the city government comes right from the council. Curren Price is in the Epstein class, and should be in jail, not on the council. Yet he's allowed to vote to strip the incoming mayor of her authority

to hire those she sees fit for the roles? Unacceptable and insane. Each council member in support of Items 19 and 20 are signalling their contempt for their constituents. I strongly urge the council to vote NO on Item 19 (26-0675) and Item 20 (26-0703)

Comment 53 of 57

William Hoose • November 19, 2026 at 1:49 PM

This seems suspiciously timed with Nithya Raman winning the mayoral race. Given that me, my household, and the majority of Angelino voters put our faith behind a vote for Raman I expect her to have the full powers of mayor and strongly oppose this charter amendment.

Comment 54 of 57

Rae Callahan • November 19, 2026 at 1:52 PM

This is blatantly an attempt to lessen the mayoral power during a lame duck period. This is corrupt and designed to reduce the power of democracy. I am extremely against this and will vote out and get organized in politics specifically to kick out any city council member who votes for this. This is disgusting.

Comment 55 of 57

Alice Nam • November 19, 2026 at 1:53 PM

My name is Alice Nam, and I'm a resident / business owner in CD1.

Balance of power in government is important. Government design should be neither rushed without due process nor delayed when the best solution is clear. The proposal to expand the City Council has been postponed for further research, but this proposal is being rushed to the ballot. The hypocrisy raises concerns that City Council is preoccupied with seizing power – not serving the people. The timing after the mayor election is also suspect. I hope these fears are misguided. I would expect members to vote no on items #19 and #20 and send them back to the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Reform for substantive review and discussion. There is more than enough time for this review before the 2028 ballot.

Comment 56 of 57

Lilia Mendoza • November 19, 2026 at 1:56 PM

This is blatently undemocratic and designed to limit the power of the elected incoming mayor. I'm very disappointing in city council for undermining the will of the people. This is a disgusting scam and I think anyone who votes for it needs to lose their job. City council is supposed to support the will of the people, not to undermine it.

Comment 57 of 57

Kevin Clackler • November 19, 2026 at 1:57 PM

Vote NO. Monica and Tim are sore losers!