COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Council File 26-0703 (2)
General Manager Removal / Los Angeles Charter Code Section 575(e) / November 2026 Ballot

Received Wednesday, November 18, 2026
26 comments

Comment 1 of 26

reina mccaughey • November 18, 2026 at 8:11 PM

Los Angeles voters chose a strong-mayor system. The Charter makes the Mayor the City's Executive Officer, and Executive Directives are how the Mayor runs the day-to-day operations of the City. Giving the Council the power to overturn those directives by a two-thirds vote would blur the line voters drew between the legislative and executive branches, and invite the Council to micromanage departments it does not run. This is wrong.

The timing makes this worse. This vote comes less than a month before a new Mayor takes office on December 14, after the voters have just chosen her. Whatever the intent, changing the powers of the Mayor's office on the way out the door — before the new Mayor has issued a single directive — will be read, fairly, as the outgoing Council tying her hands.
The council does not need a standing veto over the executive branch, the Mayor.

Please vote no on Council File 26-0675.

Respectfully,
Reina McCaughey
Woodland Hills, Council District 3

Comment 2 of 26

Maya Diakoff • November 18, 2026 at 8:48 PM

This is a blatant attempt at a power grab before Nithya Raman takes office. All council members should vote no on this.

Comment 3 of 26

Alan G • November 18, 2026 at 8:54 PM

This is pretty crooked and corrupt, what is the city hiding at this point. Please don’t even consider these proposals.

Comment 4 of 26

Matthias Dorfelt • November 18, 2026 at 9:05 PM

I was very disappointed to learn that CF-26-0703 and CF-26-0675 are scheduled for a vote this Friday.

Given that Los Angeles has just elected a new mayor, the Council's apparent rush to push through two measures that would significantly curtail the mayor's powers is deeply concerning.

It is difficult not to see this as an attempt to undermine the will of the voters. The timing alone raises serious questions, and the decision to waive committee consideration only reinforces the impression that these measures are politically motivated. If these proposals are genuinely about good governance rather than the outcome of the recent election, why the sudden urgency?

I am writing to make my position clear: If you vote in favor of either measure, I will do everything in my power to oppose your reelection.

Comment 5 of 26

Scott Kolp • November 18, 2026 at 9:07 PM

VOTE NO. I and other Angelenos will not abide this naked political power grab by the city council. Stop standing in the way of progress. The city voted for change, and we expect it. Not more corruption from the council.

Comment 6 of 26

Andrew Rittenburg • November 18, 2026 at 9:14 PM

Unbelievably corrupt attempt by the remaining council members to curb the ability of mayor elect Raman to enact her preferred agenda. Haven't been this embarrassed by council behavior since the redistricting leaked tapes. Just an absolutely shameless attempted power grab.

Comment 7 of 26

Marcus Colella • November 18, 2026 at 9:22 PM

STOP THIS POWER GRAB. This reform is horrible and is an attempt to handicap the democratically elected mayor. City council needs to stop interfering and let the mayor manage the city. I will be voting and knocking on doors against anyone who supports this measure

---

Comment 8 of 26

Rohan Jain • November 18, 2026 at 9:22 PM

Dear YSABEL,

I voted for you in the last election because I believed in your conviction to fight for Angelenos, but if you move to rush 26-0675 (item 19) and 26-0703 (item 20) and vote for these measures in a rushed attempt to circumvent the will of the citizens of Los Angeles. Me and my significant network of progressive organizers in LA will make sure that you never win another political office in this great city ever again.

Best Regards,
Rohan

Comment 9 of 26

Tanner Vandenbosch • November 18, 2026 at 9:29 PM

I strongly oppose proposed charter reform that would allow City Council to remove General Managers and Department Heads. Adding this to the agenda on short notice after an election where a new mayor was elected seems like an undemocratic power grab and reflects poorly on council.

Comment 10 of 26

Tyler Hall • November 18, 2026 at 9:29 PM

Dear Councilmember Soto-Martinez,

My name is Tyler Hall, and I am a constituent in District [4 / 13], living at 5921 Willoughby Ave, LA, 90038. I am writing to urge you to vote NO on both Council File 26-0675 (Item 19) and Council File 26-0703 (Item 20) at the Friday, November 20, 2026 City Council meeting.

Voters elect a mayor to serve as the city's chief executive and hold them accountable for delivering results. Allowing the City Council to overturn Executive Directives and remove department General Managers—who would suddenly answer to 16 different bosses—will paralyze city agencies and undermine effective, decisive leadership.

Los Angeles already has important checks on mayoral power, unlike cities with strong mayors like New York. Allowing the City Council to override Executive Directives would significantly undermine bold executive action on vital issues such as housing, affordability, and essential city services. When voters elect a mayor, they expect effective leadership—not the constant interruption of directives by a council of 15.

As your constituent, I urge you to reject these measures and support a governance framework that prioritizes thorough public input before implementing major changes.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,
Tyler M. Hall
5921 Willoughby Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90038
310-766-2960

Comment 11 of 26

Johan Alvelais • November 18, 2026 at 9:35 PM

Honorable President and Members of the Council:

I submit this comment in opposition to CF 26-0703, which would place before voters a Charter amendment allowing two-thirds of the Council to remove a general manager, department head, or board member from any City department, office, or board.

Charter Section 575(e) and the strong-mayor framework place department leadership under mayoral appointment for a reason: continuity, and professional management insulated from day-to-day political pressure. A two-thirds Council removal power would subject every general manager and department head to permanent political leverage. Managers who know twelve votes can end their careers will manage to twelve offices rather than to the public.

The predictable results are politicized service delivery, accelerated leadership churn, and retaliation and patronage made structural rather than exceptional. Departments that depend on technical expertise and long-term planning, from water and power to planning to public works, cannot function well when their leaders serve at the pleasure of a shifting legislative majority. A Council that believes a department head is failing already has remedies: hearings, budget conditions, and pressure on the appointing authority.

The process behind this item is equally troubling. It was continued by the Rules, Elections and Intergovernmental Relations Committee in May and June 2026, re-referred to the Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Review on August 28, and that committee waived consideration entirely without deliberation. The motion names the "November 2026 ballot," a date that has already passed, while the City Clerk has identified November 18, 2027 as the last day to adopt ballot resolutions for the March 7, 2028 primary. A permanent change of this consequence should not advance on a waived-review, outdated-timeline track.

I respectfully urge the Council to decline to prepare this measure for the ballot. If Councilmembers believe department leadership should be politically accountable to this body, they should make that case fully and honestly to voters after genuine deliberation, not through a rushed referral that the Charter Review process itself declined to examine.
Respectfully submitted,

Johan Alvelais

Comment 12 of 26

Lorena Ramos • November 18, 2026 at 9:35 PM

This is ridiculous and should not be voted on by any of the council members. The people voted for change when they voted for Nithya. Stop being sore losers and let her do her job!

Comment 13 of 26

Duane Luu • November 18, 2026 at 9:42 PM

Blatant power grab by council members threatened by the incoming mayor. I've been a resident of the Arts District for over four years now and am utterly embarrassed to have Jurado as my council representative. This motion should not pass.

Comment 14 of 26

Andrew Silagy • November 18, 2026 at 9:45 PM

I oppose this proposed charter amendment. It risks undermining the authority and accountability of the Mayor by giving the City Council an additional mechanism to remove department leadership, potentially for political reasons rather than legitimate performance concerns. Voters elect a Mayor to lead the executive branch and take responsibility for its management. That responsibility must come with the authority to appoint, direct, and hold department heads accountable. Creating a parallel removal power for the Council blurs the separation of responsibilities, invites political interference in departmental leadership, and risks making

effective governance more difficult. Accountability is important, but this proposal shifts the balance of power in the wrong direction.

Comment 15 of 26

Matt Nelson • November 18, 2026 at 9:56 PM

I strongly oppose this motion. Leadership by committee is no leadership. LA needs decisive action on issues and waiting on committee decisions to waste TAX payer money. This will lead to no accountability and further wasting of taxpayer moneys. Please realize this is NOT your money this is TAX payer money.

Comment 16 of 26

Matty Larrabee • November 18, 2026 at 10:02 PM

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Council File 26-0703, which seeks to expand the City Council's authority to remove general managers and department heads by a two-thirds vote.

Los Angeles operates under a mayor-council system of government in which executive and legislative responsibilities are deliberately divided. The Mayor is responsible for administering city departments, while the City Council exercises legislative, budgetary, confirmation, and oversight powers. This separation is essential to maintaining clear lines of accountability.

The proposed amendment threatens to undermine that balance by giving the legislative branch additional authority over executive personnel decisions.

The City Council already possesses substantial mechanisms for holding department leadership accountable, including confirmation authority, budgetary oversight, public hearings, and the ability to reinstate certain officials removed by the Mayor. The proponents of this amendment have not adequately demonstrated why these existing mechanisms are insufficient or why granting the Council independent removal authority is necessary.

I am particularly concerned about the potential for this authority to be used for political purposes, especially during transitions between mayoral administrations. Department heads should be evaluated based on their performance, qualifications, and ability to serve the public, not their willingness to accommodate the political preferences of individual Councilmembers or Council factions.

Furthermore, expanding the Council's removal authority risks creating conflicting chains of command. If the Mayor is responsible for administering city departments but the Council can independently dismiss their leadership, who is ultimately accountable for those departments' performance? The public deserves a government in which responsibility and authority are clearly aligned.

Charter reform should strengthen democratic accountability, not redistribute executive authority without a demonstrated need and appropriate safeguards.

I urge the City Council to reject this proposal and preserve the separation of executive and legislative responsibilities established under the Los Angeles City Charter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comment 17 of 26

Esmeralda Lopez • November 18, 2026 at 10:23 PM

I am in strong opposition to item 20 (Council File 26-0703). This proposal risks politicizing the leadership of city departments and creating instability throughout municipal government. Department heads are responsible for implementing policies, managing essential services, and overseeing the day-to-day operations that directly affect millions of Los Angeles residents. Their leadership should be evaluated based on performance, qualifications, and their ability to serve the public, not made vulnerable to shifting political alliances or disagreements within the City Council.

The timing also deserves scrutiny as Los Angeles transitions to a new mayoral administration. We should not be creating additional mechanisms that could undermine an incoming Mayor's ability to assemble and maintain an effective leadership team. These changes would establish a precedent that could affect future administrations regardless of political affiliation.

Los Angeles needs stable, qualified departmental leadership and clear accountability, not another avenue for political interference that could disrupt essential city services.

City Council should reject item 20.

Comment 18 of 26

Nunya • November 18, 2026 at 10:36 PM

This is ridiculous. This was introduced in MAY?! and now you suspiciously want to push it through….Not when it was received 7 months ago and Karen Bass was throwing money at cops and surprised-pikachu-facing the millions of dollars meant to address homelessness that just "mysteriously" vanished. That the residents of this city *actually* voted for.

Look my corrupt establishment babes, your turn is over. Let the new Mayor- whom again, WAS CHOSEN BY THE RESIDENTS OF THIS CITY- cook. Cause if you strip her ability to bring about change people not only want but NEED, you're gonna end up with a much more violent revolution than where we're at now (not a threat, just a fact. People have already passed their limits and this bubble bout to burst).

Anyway, y'all aren't clever or sneaky and people are finally noticing your despicable tactics. Good luck, you gonna need it.

Comment 19 of 26

Mary Standfier • November 18, 2026 at 10:40 PM

For Council File 26-0703 (Agenda Item 20 – General Manager Removal)

Position: Opposed / Vote NO

As a resident of Council District 10, I strongly urge the Council to vote NO on Council File 26-0703. Seeking to amend the Charter to let the Council remove General Managers and Department Heads is a clear attempt to weaken our incoming Mayor, Nithya Raman, and limit her ability to implement the policies Angelenos elected her to carry out. Voters chose Mayor-elect Raman to lead this city, and she deserves the executive authority needed to manage city departments effectively. District 10 residents are paying close attention to who stands with the electorate and who tries to undermine our incoming Mayor. We will remember this vote in the next election. Please vote NO.

Comment 20 of 26

Natally Magana • November 18, 2026 at 10:43 PM

I oppose

Comment 21 of 26

Kevin Zimmerman • November 18, 2026 at 10:50 PM

I'm a 25 year LA resident and homeowner/taxpayer payer. I strongly oppose this action.

Comment 22 of 26

Angel Macias • November 18, 2026 at 10:52 PM

Dear City Council,

The city of Los Angeles elected Nithya Raman to bring her vision for change to fruition.
I implore the city council to not hinder Nithya's ability to do the job she was hired to do.
Please vote against this motion.

Comment 23 of 26

Taylor Dolezal • November 18, 2026 at 10:53 PM

Could you clarify what the Council will be asked to vote on Friday for items 19 and 20, and which election the proposals are intended for? Please ask the Council to hold both items for the December Charter Review discussion so residents can see the proposed language and weigh in before either proposal moves forward.

Comment 24 of 26

Zachary Nelson • November 18, 2026 at 11:02 PM

Why are you submitting these changes before the new mayor? Do not try and impose these limits for a mayor who's actually trying to do something.

Comment 25 of 26

Jonathan Moore • November 18, 2026 at 11:28 PM

I want it on the record that I think this is a shady, self-serving power grab. You should be ashamed of yourselves!!!

For four years, not one Council-member raised this. Not once. And the second the voters elected a new Mayor, suddenly it matters?? That’s not oversight. You did nothing for four years, and now you want to take away the new Mayor’s basic tools for running the city, and you’re trying to rush it through in the lame-duck window while everyone’s distracted. I'd kick both of your sorry butts to the curb if you were my council-member. Self-serving is what you are! SHAME ON YOU BOTH! This reeks of corruption or at the very least political pettiness!

The city’s own charter process was going to look at this in 2028. Now your trying to bypass that?! That is not an accident.

Do your jobs Jurado and Bkumenfield! Stop playing games!

Comment 26 of 26

David Schneidinger • November 18, 2026 at 11:45 PM

Do not pass 26-0703 or 26-0675. I am a member of CD5 and this is absolutely absurd. You are trying to strip power away from the mayor just because you don't like who won. The people made their voices heard on November 3rd. This council file is a direct attack on our democratic process. Unacceptable.
