# COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

**Council File 26-0703**

General Manager Removal / Los Angeles Charter Code Section 575(e) / November 2026 Ballot

Received Thursday, November 19, 2026

42 comments

---

**Comment 1 of 42**

Jacky Tran • November 19, 2026 at 12:09 AM

What is this even? This feels like a weird power grab by the council to give more power to the council? Because that's not corruption at all! We love when people in power are hungry and focused on gaining more power. Because that's a sign of good government! Especially when the council members are suppressing the charter reform suggestion of expanding council! This is sarcasm being used a rhetorical tool if that is not clear. This change in the charter doesn't follow any of the commission suggestions! A better use of your positions of influence would be voting for everyone on council to get raises! Stab me in the front you know what I'm saying? Vote no. This is a petty power grag, and voters will remember.  Oh my god, why is this even a motion. Tustin. TUSTIN!!! is doing better than us right now.

---

**Comment 2 of 42**

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 42**

Vedant Patel • November 19, 2026 at 12:51 AM

To the members of the LA City Council,

I strongly urge you to vote against changing the city charter and instead to keep oversight of General Managers in the hands of only the Mayor. We as the residents of Los Angeles made our voices clear in this election about our desire for change in the direction of how this city is governed and its priorities through the comfortable victory of mayor-elect Raman. Council File 26-0703 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 for the city quickly and effectively. In fact, this proposed change to the charter would be blatantly anti-democratic and subvert the will of the voters by undermining the possibility of popular, meaningful changes and reforms from the incoming mayor, or any future mayor, from ever happening in the first place if they cannot even have the power to be the primary oversight of their own general managers.

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 which has stymied any attempts to change our trajectory.

**Comment 4 of 42**

Matthew MacDonald • November 19, 2026 at 1:14 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 42**

P. Kedilaya • November 19, 2026 at 2:35 AM

I am writing to formally oppose Agenda Item 20 (Council File 26-0703). Allowing the City Council to remove General Managers and Department Heads fragments chain of command so that city agencies answer to 16 bosses rather than the Mayor. Also, bypassing public hearings in the Charter Review Committee erodes public trust. Please vote NO on Item 20.

**Comment 6 of 42**

John Sutter • November 19, 2026 at 3:11 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 7 of 42**

Bruce Krysiak • November 19, 2026 at 5:18 AM

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

I can see the point, but it does feel like the Mayor should be able to choose their team without interference - if City Council rejects effective personnel for political reasons vs questions of competence, that doesn't feel right.

Key issues are things like:

- Is removal of a department head restricted to documented cause?
- Must an independent report or public hearing precede removal?
- Does the mayor get an opportunity to respond?

...and probably others, all of which require time to consider and recommend with thoughtful diligence, not slapdash haste.  Reject this motion until it has passed more diligent muster.

---

**Comment 8 of 42**

Christopher Gehrke • November 19, 2026 at 6:47 AM

This motion should not be considered. These administrative positions should focus on being productive, apolitical experts. With input from the council, these critical positions will fall pray to over-politicization.

---

**Comment 9 of 42**

Veronica Doering • November 19, 2026 at 7:07 AM

The mayor should be able to pick her team without interference. This is wrong and i am against it. LA mayor is already weak enough.

---

**Comment 10 of 42**

Charles Thomson • November 19, 2026 at 7:34 AM

I live in Highland Park, Los Angeles 90042. I'm writing to ask you to vote no on Council File 26-0703 which would allow two-thirds of the Council to remove a general manager or department head. I voted for mayor Raman so she could make change and now you are trying to reduce her power before she even starts.  This is against what the people voted for.

---

**Comment 11 of 42**

Jax • November 19, 2026 at 7:52 AM

The hell is this push? Let the mayor remain in charge. That's why they're the mayor.

---

**Comment 12 of 42**

Nik Alvarez • November 19, 2026 at 8:01 AM

This proposal raises serious concerns about political control over the people responsible for running essential city departments. Giving politicians additional authority to remove department heads risks turning public administration into an extension of political relationships, personal agendas, and power struggles.

Los Angeles does not need more concentration of political power. It needs greater transparency, meaningful accountability, responsible management, and public institutions that serve residents rather than political interests.

The City Charter should not be rewritten to make it easier for those already holding political

power to exert greater control over the city's administration without sufficient safeguards against political retaliation and abuse.

Let me be absolutely clear: If elected officials choose to prioritize political power and insider interests over the working people of Los Angeles, I am prepared to commit substantial personal financial resources to a sustained public accountability campaign. That includes funding advertising, exposing their voting records, documenting their decisions, and making sure voters understand exactly who is responsible. I will work to ensure that every elected official who supports this proposal faces public scrutiny and a serious electoral challenge. Public office is a privilege, not a lifetime entitlement, and voters have every right to hold those who abuse their power accountable at the ballot box.

**Comment 13 of 42**

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

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

**Comment 14 of 42**

Josh Saltsman • November 19, 2026 at 8:33 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 15 of 42**

Richard • November 19, 2026 at 8:54 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 16 of 42**

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 17 of 42**

Jairi Sanchez • November 19, 2026 at 9:16 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 removing general managers. 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), 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 18 of 42**

Angela Heine • November 19, 2026 at 9:48 AM

We the people voted for Nithya Raman to bring some needed changes to Los Angeles. Please vote no on this and use your leadership to help the people of Los Angeles thrive with opportunities for housing and opportunities for public transit and so much more that can help everyone.

---

**Comment 19 of 42**

Christopher Ray • November 19, 2026 at 9:50 AM

I oppose this motion. The mayor's office is already too weak. This change to the city charter will only make that problem worse.

---

**Comment 20 of 42**

Elizabeth Diaz • November 19, 2026 at 9:57 AM

Los Angeles City Council:

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Items 19 and 20, as these proposals would give the City Council too much power over the mayor and city departments. There are already too many cooks in the kitchen, and giving the Council even more authority could lead to political interference, gridlock, and less accountability. These proposals appear to be more about expanding the Council's power than addressing the urgent issues facing Angelenos. Councilmember Eunisses Hernandez, I voted for you because your values aligned with mine and those of my neighborhood HIGHLAND PARK, and I would be extremely disappointed if you voted Yes on either item. If you support these proposals, you will lose my support for any future political campaign, including after your current term ends in 2030.

---

**Comment 21 of 42**

Charles Butler • November 19, 2026 at 10:01 AM

As a resident of Boyle Heights, and constituent of CD 14, I was incredibly disappointed to learn that Ysabel Jurado proposed this motion. She's made public comments about working together with mayor-elect Raman, but 19 and 20 seem like direct ways to limit her power and influence, before she's even taken office.

I deeply hope you will reconsider, and vote NO on both.

---

**Comment 22 of 42**

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 23 of 42**

Brian Dang • November 19, 2026 at 10:16 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 24 of 42**

Mike C • November 19, 2026 at 10:34 AM

Dear Los Angeles City Council Members,

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 25 of 42**

Paul Lee • November 19, 2026 at 10:41 AM

I am a Los Angeles resident in council district 10 and I oppose council 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 26 of 42**

Mark Weathers • November 19, 2026 at 11:03 AM

No! if you vote for this I will do all in my power to get you out of office

---

**Comment 27 of 42**

Marina del Rey resident • November 19, 2026 at 12:25 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 28 of 42**

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 29 of 42**

Joseph Carlin • November 19, 2026 at 12:49 PM

My name is Joseph Carlin, and I’m a constituent from Council district 10.

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,
Joseph Carlin

**Comment 30 of 42**

Laura cowan • November 19, 2026 at 12:54 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 31 of 42**

Jeffrey Alan Miller • November 19, 2026 at 1:00 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 32 of 42**

Austin Si • November 19, 2026 at 1:03 PM

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

I'm a researcher at UCLA and an avid user of public transit to get around the city. I also walk around both Westwood and Palms quite often. I was excited for Nithya's campaign for mayor because she promised to reduce homelessness in LA and improve public transit. These are both things that would make me feel safer and more sure of how I get around LA. However, they seem like they would be made more difficult to achieve given this charter amendment.

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 here in LA voted for Nithya because we wanted improvements to our city. To pass charter amendments like this one now, would feel like a slap in the face to all of us. 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 33 of 42**

Ben B McShane • November 19, 2026 at 1:12 PM

Do not pass this item. Los Angeles voted for Mayor Raman to enact her agenda, and the city does not want City Council to undermine that agenda. Empower the new mayor, do not obstruct her.

**Comment 34 of 42**

Dimitra Skouras • November 19, 2026 at 1:14 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 35 of 42**

Bryan Bernart • November 19, 2026 at 1:15 PM

It is unacceptable entirely unnecessary for City Council to take hiring and firing power away from the Office of the Mayor. 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 36 of 42**

Yolanda Mack • November 19, 2026 at 1:18 PM

I'm a Council District 3 resident in Reseda, and I oppose Item 20. Letting the council remove department heads by a two-thirds vote would take management of city departments away from the mayor voters just elected, weeks before she takes office. This motion skipped committee

review, and no community impact statements have been filed. If this idea has merit, it deserves a full public process after the new mayor is sworn in. Please vote NO.

Yolanda Mack, Reseda

**Comment 37 of 42**

Doris Lemieux • November 19, 2026 at 1:20 PM

Vote No on 26-0703. Do not undermine the balance of power with the mayor.

**Comment 38 of 42**

Michael Hopson • November 19, 2026 at 1:40 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 39 of 42**

Cameron Colony • November 19, 2026 at 1:48 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. It's patently absurd that Alyssa Walker can stall and shrink public housing for years, while voting to strip the incoming mayor of her authority regarding Executive Orders. 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 40 of 42**

William Hoose • November 19, 2026 at 1:50 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 41 of 42**

Alice Nam • November 19, 2026 at 1:55 PM

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 42 of 42**

Kevin Clackler • November 19, 2026 at 1:59 PM

Vote No!
Monica sucks as a person