

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Judy Citrin

**Date Submitted:** 04/29/2026 04:20 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support Ranked Choice Voting as a fair and equitable way to determine the winners or city elections.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chad Shields

**Date Submitted:** 04/29/2026 08:52 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmembers, As an LA City resident who has followed the Charter Reform Commission process across its hearings, I am writing in support of three interconnected reforms now before this Committee: police accountability provisions (Chief authority to remove officers with repeated histories of harm; Council ordinance power over LAPD; First Amendment protections for press and protest); council expansion to 25 districts; and ranked-choice voting for municipal elections beginning 2032. These reforms share a common structural logic. Each addresses a defect in how power is currently distributed in the City Charter, and each does so by adding democratic accountability rather than by concentrating executive authority. POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY The most common objection I have heard from Council offices is that ordinance power over LAPD would "politicize" policing. I want to address this directly. Policing in Los Angeles is already political. Use-of-force policy is political. The choice to deploy CRASH, then HAMMER, then Metro Division surge tactics in particular neighborhoods was political. The decisions that drove hundreds of millions in police misconduct settlements over the past decade were political. The only question the Charter places before voters this November is whether those political choices remain insulated inside a five-member appointed Police Commission, or whether the elected body that voters have chosen also has a role. The Commission's proposal is modest. Council does not gain unilateral control; it gains the same ordinance authority it exercises over every other department. The Chief retains discretion; Council gains a backstop on retention decisions where Boards of Rights have produced outcomes the Inspector General has documented as systematically lenient. None of this is radical. It is parity. On recruitment: stronger civilian oversight does not, on the evidence, depress hiring. What it tends to filter out are the officers generating the lawsuits the General Fund is currently absorbing. That is a feature of accountability, not a bug. The liability insurance proposal deserves more time. Council File 24-0600-S37 has requested reportbacks on alternative liability structures, and I urge the Committee to ensure those reports return in time to inform the FY 2027–28 budget cycle. A well-designed system can protect officers acting in good faith while creating real cost signals

for the department's repeat offenders. We should get this right rather than fast. COUNCIL EXPANSION AND RANKED-CHOICE VOTING Council districts of roughly 260,000 residents are not districts in any meaningful sense; they are small congressional seats. Expansion to 25 districts brings each district closer to 160,000, which is still larger than the average state legislative district but closer to a scale at which a councilmember can plausibly know their constituents. The OUR LA coalition has made the case for 31; the Commission settled on 25. Either is an improvement. The objections I have heard are voter confusion, taxpayer cost, and departmental burden. On confusion: Australians have ranked candidates since 1918. Minneapolis, San Francisco, New York City, and twenty-plus other American jurisdictions use ranked-choice voting without crisis. The Commission's recommendation includes a language accessibility ordinance precisely to address implementation. Treating voters as incapable of ranking is not a neutral concern; it is a political position about who deserves a voice. On cost: more districts mean more staff, but also smaller staff per district. The Ethics Commission has already flagged matching-funds implications, which the Commission's package addresses by enabling Council to adjust the program by ordinance. The net fiscal picture is contested; the democratic picture is not. On departments reporting to "ten more bosses": departments already report to fifteen councilmembers, the Mayor, the CAO, the City Attorney, and the relevant commissions. The marginal coordination cost of ten additional offices is small compared to the marginal accountability gain of districts small enough for residents to actually contact their representatives. The 2022 Fed Tapes were not a personnel scandal. They were a structural disclosure of how power operates in a fifteen-district city where redistricting is negotiated among incumbents and three of those incumbents represent a fifth of the population. The reforms above will not solve that on their own. They will, however, give the next generation of Angelenos institutional tools this generation did not have. I urge the Committee to advance all three reform packages to the full Council, and to resist the temptation to narrow the ballot to whatever feels safest. Voters can handle complexity. They have less patience for a charter that protects the people who wrote it. Thank you for your work, and for the opportunity to comment. Chad Shields Resident, Council District 13