

Communication from Public

Name: Karen Broome

Date Submitted: 10/18/2022 10:19 AM

Council File No: 22-1196

Comments for Public Posting: I voted for Kevin Deleon in the past. I withdraw all support from him. Kevin Deleon and Gil Cedillo MUST resign. The fact that they haven't when the president and the local newspaper and everyone else thinks they should go is selfish and harms our city every day this goes on. People die in protests that have this much personal passion behind them. All three of the people on that recording should move to Alaska and never seek to be a public servant again. They were self-servants. Mitch O'Farrell won't be getting another vote from me. Anything these people support, I will seek out opposing progressive views. The L.A. city council needs expansion and purging. Redistricting needs an independent commission. You folks know Nury. Why was a trash talker like that ever made president? You are cowards holding these meetings online. I am a citizen and I have a right to attend. Fuck Mitch McConnell for attempting to silence rightful protest because they're coming for him now too.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/18/2022 09:28 AM

Council File No: 22-1196

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Los Angeles City Council Members, On behalf of our coalitions of grassroots organizations, we respectfully request you to consider introducing the following amendment to agenda item 41 during today's City Council meeting. It is incredibly important the Council begin to take steps to restore the public's trust in this institution and in our fractured democracy. Democratically Yours, Los Angeles Democracy Vouchers Unrig LA California Ranked Choice Voting Coalition

BACKGROUND On June 8th, 1999, the voters of the City of Los Angeles approved the first comprehensive update to our charter in 74 years. The process began with two rivaling commissions, one appointed and one elected, who eventually agreed upon a common set of reforms. Their common proposal carried enormous weight, as the elected commission had authority to circumvent city council and put the measure directly on the ballot. That authority to put measures directly on the ballot was central to our city beginning the charter reform process on two separate tracks. The City Attorney gave evolving views on whether an appointed commission could put a measure directly on the ballot, first saying they could not and then saying it was possible. Ultimately council declined to provide this authority to the appointed commission, and advocates turned towards pushing a successful measure to create an elected commission. The creation and authority of appointed and elected commissioners are governed by City and State law. Both options, as currently provided, contain advantages and disadvantages. Appointed commissions lack independence, while the process for assembling elected commissions presents its own problems. As explained in a 2003 Ethics Commission memo, "candidates for a charter commission are not subject to the campaign finance provisions of Charter Sec. 470 and the Campaign Finance Ordinance." Furthermore, conducting elections and empaneling a commission can take a great deal of time. To restore trust in the charter review process, other cities have created a regular and independent process for evaluating their city charter. These periodic charter review commissions provide a transparent and diligent process for addressing the city's governance issues. Under such a process, City Council convenes a commission every 5-10 years, electing or appointing an independent body of commissioners reflective of the city's population for a two-year

review and recommendation process. A similar process has been in place in Portland, Oregon since 2007, and the results are promising. The amendment to create a regular charter commission received 76% of the vote in 2007. In its first convening in 2010, the charter review commission referred nine amendments to the ballot, all of which were adopted by more than 75% of the vote.

RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT LANGUAGE 3. INSTRUCT the Chief Legislative Analyst, with assistance from the City Attorney, City Ethics Commission, City Clerk, and other departments as needed, to report within 60 days with options for utilizing an appointed or elected charter reform commission. The report should include, among other topics, the following: An overview of procedures in City and State law for creating a charter commission, whether elected or appointed. An analysis of whether an appointed charter reform commission could place a measure directly on the ballot, as an elected commission is permitted to; An analysis on whether the council's appointing authority could be delegated to an outside body, such as the ethics commission, who would receive applications, interview candidates, and make their appointments through a public process; Any conflict of interest provisions that could be adopted precluding participation of those who have recently worked for an elected official, a local candidate's campaign, or as a lobbyist at any level of government. Options for creating removal proceedings for an appointed commissioner. Any best practices for a charter reform commission, including but not limited to notice requirements for meetings, commissioner deliberation, public participation, and anticipated staffing costs; An overview of options for conducting elections for an elected charter commission, including whether candidates need a plurality or a majority of votes; Recommendations for any means through which the city could subject candidates for an elected charter commission to campaign finance provisions.



October 18, 2022

Honorable Los Angeles City Council Members,

On behalf of our coalitions of grassroots organizations, we respectfully request you to consider introducing the following amendment to agenda item 41 during today's City Council meeting. It is incredibly important the Council begin to take steps to restore the public's trust in this institution and in our fractured democracy.

Democratically Yours,

Los Angeles Democracy Vouchers

Unrig LA

California Ranked Choice Voting Coalition

BACKGROUND

On June 8th, 1999, the voters of the City of Los Angeles approved the first comprehensive update to our charter in 74 years. The process began with two rivaling commissions, one appointed and one elected, who eventually agreed upon a common set of reforms. Their common proposal carried enormous weight, as the elected commission had authority to circumvent city council and put the measure directly on the ballot.

That authority to put measures directly on the ballot was central to our city beginning the charter reform process on two separate tracks. The City Attorney gave evolving views on whether an appointed commission could put a measure directly on the ballot, first saying they could not and then saying it was possible. Ultimately council declined to provide this authority to the appointed commission, and advocates turned towards pushing a successful measure to create an elected commission.

The creation and authority of appointed and elected commissioners are governed by City and State law. Both options, as currently provided, contain advantages and disadvantages. Appointed commissions lack independence, while the process for assembling elected commissions presents its own problems. As explained in a 2003

Ethics Commission memo, “candidates for a charter commission are not subject to the campaign finance provisions of Charter Sec. 470 and the Campaign Finance Ordinance.” Furthermore, conducting elections and empaneling a commission can take a great deal of time.

To restore trust in the charter review process, other cities have created a regular and independent process for evaluating their city charter. These periodic charter review commissions provide a transparent and diligent process for addressing the city's governance issues. Under such a process, City Council convenes a commission every 5-10 years, electing or appointing an independent body of commissioners reflective of the city's population for a two-year review and recommendation process. A similar process has been in place in Portland, Oregon since 2007, and the results are promising. The amendment to create a regular charter commission received 76% of the vote in 2007. In its first convening in 2010, the charter review commission referred nine amendments to the ballot, all of which were adopted by more than 75% of the vote.

RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

3. INSTRUCT the Chief Legislative Analyst, with assistance from the City Attorney, City Ethics Commission, City Clerk, and other departments as needed, to report within 60 days with options for utilizing an appointed or elected charter reform commission. The report should include, among other topics, the following:

- An overview of procedures in City and State law for creating a charter commission, whether elected or appointed.
- An analysis of whether an appointed charter reform commission could place a measure directly on the ballot, as an elected commission is permitted to;
- An analysis on whether the council's appointing authority could be delegated to an outside body, such as the ethics commission, who would receive applications, interview candidates, and make their appointments through a public process;
- Any conflict of interest provisions that could be adopted precluding participation of those who have recently worked for an elected official, a local candidate's campaign, or as a lobbyist at any level of government.
- Options for creating removal proceedings for an appointed commissioner.
- Any best practices for a charter reform commission, including but not limited to notice requirements for meetings, commissioner deliberation, public participation, and anticipated staffing costs;
- An overview of options for conducting elections for an elected charter commission, including whether candidates need a plurality or a majority of votes;

- Recommendations for any means through which the city could subject candidates for an elected charter commission to campaign finance provisions.

4. INSTRUCT the Chief Legislative Analyst, with assistance from the City Attorney, City Clerk, and other departments as needed, to report within 60 days with options for creating a process through which an independent charter review commission, reflective of the City in terms of its racial and ethnic diversity, age, and geography, would be assembled by statutory requirement every five years to review and introduce amendments to the City’s charter directly on the ballot. The report should include, among other topics, the following:

- An analysis of the effectiveness of independent charter review commissions in other cities, such as Portland, Oregon; and
- An analysis of options for selecting commissioners, including appointments, elections, sortition, and hybrid models, that considers maximizing commission independence, members’ qualifications, and a direct path to ballot; and
- An analysis of options for a ranked-choice style ballot where voters would see three options on the same topic and would rank them: (1) charter commission proposal; (2) city council proposal; (3) status quo; and
- Recommendations for the establishment of a Periodic Independent Charter Review Commission in the City of Los Angeles, taking into account:
 - Best practices for periodic, independent charter review commissions, including but not limited to commissioner selection, scope setting and deliberation, public participation, and anticipated staffing costs; and
 - Recommendations for a timeline of key charter review activities, taking into account windows for commission deliberation, public participation, and amendment referrals that would maximize public engagement.

Communication from Public

Name: Timothy Hornor
Date Submitted: 10/18/2022 10:31 AM
Council File No: 22-1196

Comments for Public Posting: I'm a resident of district 10, and my family stands with the community in DEMANDING the resignations of Kevin De Leon and Gil Cedillo. I'm confident you all heard the people of this city chanting in unison "no resignation, no meeting" last week. Proceeding with today's meeting makes you complicit with the actions of your colleagues and it is unacceptable. Is what they did not awful enough for you? Not just what they said, but what they were DOING in that meeting in the first place? How abhorrent would something need to be for YOU to stand with US? I am the father of two small children, working full-time. That Kevin De Leon SEES the people standing together, showing up repeatedly at City Hall, camped out on his block - and still refuses to step down only illustrates how deep his flawed thinking goes. We don't have time for this. Folks don't want to be camping out just to get what's so OBVIOUSLY RIGHT HERE! You should all stand with us and deny quorum until Kevin De Leon and Gil Cedillo resign. No resignation, no meeting.

Communication from Public

Name: Julianna Kufeldt

Date Submitted: 10/18/2022 12:12 PM

Council File No: 22-1196

Comments for Public Posting: For general comment: Cedillo and DeLeon need to resign. Since you are still on the council you both are wasting the time of everyone. No one wants you here! And to the remaining councilmembers who are continuing in this meeting(s) - you are complicit in the racism and bigotry. These meetings are pointless and they continuing the anti-blackness corruption in this city!