

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James M

**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 12:55 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi Rules Committee, I am writing to strongly support a number of reforms, but want to focus on the expansion to 25 single seats. Objections to this have primarily focused on cost, which is an understandable concern. However, I believe both that the costs are being over-estimated, and that even should they prove correct, that the moral urgency of expansion is enough to suggest that it should be figured out by 2032. We are a city that is on the edge of the future. We should have the methods of representation, and mechanisms like RCV to support us, in that moment. In addition, I've attached an informational / contextual memo with all of the proposed reforms for Thursday's meeting. Best, James

# Charter Reference Sheet - 5/21/2026

Prepared by: *Justi Sexton, Chad Shields, James Moore*

## Council Expansion and Ethics

### CRC 12: Expansion to 25

**Charter** | **Minor Adjustments**

Expand the City Council to 25 single-member districts, which shall be effective in 2032 upon the adoption of the final redistricting plan.

[§241](#) [§487](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Effective in 2032, giving six years of lead time.
- Estimated to cost between +25.2m (UCLA est.) to +21m (CLA est.) overall assuming per-office budget remains flat.
- At Commission, the numbers considered ranged from 21-31, with outliers at 17 and 35.
- Generally any number over 31 was considered to begin to negatively impact representation, especially with AAPI.
- Multi-member districting with PRCV was considered and then eventually removed for reasons of perceived "overcomplication".
- A "Resident maximum" was not considered (i.e. "No district shall have over 160,000 Residents").
- Received fourth highest public comments in favor by subject, with 7.13% of total.
- Interacts with Independent Redistricting Commission.

**Recommendation:** If the ultimate goal is more accessible representation: one large jump is the least disruptive path to success. A "Gradual Increase" model would lead to greater district disruption and be more divisive.

Regarding the expense issue, we are somewhat skeptical that expenses would remain flat with such a sharp expansion. There are options for such an expansion that would involve smaller per-district offices but greater shared council resources. This could interact as well with bifurcation of City Attorney.

#### Supplemental:

 [Budget Implications of Council Expansion.pdf](#)

[22-1196-S1\\_rpt\\_CLA\\_09-15-23.pdf](#)

[Council Expansion Report](#)

## Clerk; Elections

### CRC 22: Ranked Choice Voting

**Charter** | **Ready For Council**

Creates a Ranked Choice Voting system that replaces the current electoral runoff system; effective in 2032

§ 428 (New)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Effective in 2032 based on the amount of time it would take to update voting machines and mechanisms.
- One of the most popular reforms, receiving the third-highest public comment by subject (10.93% overall).
- Interacts with Rodriguez Motion 5/1 that seeks to understand RCV vs Approval Voting.
- RCV has a much more robust history of research than Approval Voting.

- Cheaper than First Past the Post, as it eliminates runoff elections and reduces the need for primaries (although primaries can still occur if desired, as per the New York City model.)

**Recommendation:** We are strongly in favor of RCV, as it has a robust body of research showing that it is more effective than First Past The Post in ensuring representation in government.

**Supplemental:** [RCV Ranked Choice Voting vs. Approval Voting - FairVote](#)

## CRC 23: 16+ Voting

**Charter** | **Ready For Council**

Lowers the voting age to 16 and allows these individuals to vote in elections for City offices and members of the Board of Education

§ 408

[CRC Redline](#)

- Ordinance-Enablement Only.
- Allow 16+ individuals to vote in City and LAUSD elections.
- 16+ individuals are currently allowed to serve on commissions for the city.

**Recommendation:** An easy pass-forward, this simply opens the door to further council action.

## CRC 24: Lower Ballot Threshold

**Charter** | **Ready For Council**

Changes ballot access requirements by extending filing deadlines/collection timeframes; lowers the signature threshold for nominating petitions to 350 registered voters (previously 500)

§ 421-422

[CRC Redline](#)

- Advocated from FairRep.
- Reduces initial startup costs for running.
- Designed to reduce incumbency advantage.
- Arguments against included that a higher threshold decreases the amount of "unqualified" candidates.
- County offices do not see major increases in candidates, despite an only 50 signature threshold for qualification.

**Recommendation:** This is a relatively simple reform that would reduce incumbency advantage.

## CRC 25: Commissioner Removals

**Charter** | **Ready For Council**

Extends the appointment window of commissioners from 45 days to 60 days when a vacancy occurs on a commission/board; prohibits appointing authority from requiring prospective appointees to sign a letter of resignation.

§ 502

[CRC Redline](#)

**Recommendation:** Closes a loophole in some commissions where a commissioner is not able to be replaced.

## CRC 36: Special Election for Vacancy

**Charter** | **Minor Adjustments**

Requires that a special election be called when a vacancy in City offices occur and the vacancy occurs more than one year before the expiration of the term of office; Special election must be held within 180 days of the vacancy

[§ 409](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Designed to prevent a district from going unrepresented for too long.
- When the special election "triggers" is not clear - specifically in the meaning of vacancy. (i.e. does missing 50% of meetings count as vacancy, or a substantial illness, etc.)
- Who identifies and triggers the vacancy is also not clear.
- Could potentially interact with city council's ability to remove - a similar option could be effected by allowing for removal "for substantial attendance issues."

**Recommendation:** A definition and designated "identifier" of vacancy should be established here - possibly the CAO, or the City Attorney. However, this seems a necessary item to establish here or to additionally specify that city council can remove council members for "substantial attendance issues".

## Ethics Commission

### CRC 26: Inspector General

[Charter](#) | [Not Ready](#)

Creates an Inspector General position for the Ethics Commission that has the power to audit and investigate City officials and departments.

[§ 713 \(NEW\)](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- This body would be seen as the lead investigative body for elected officials and elected official programs.
- Interacts with Controller reforms in that a disallowance of Controller to audit elected official programs was declined in favor of this reform.
- Some concerns about the conflict between "Auditing" and "Investigative" powers, which are meaningfully different in execution.

**Recommendation:** This is a good idea but does not feel considered for such a sweeping reform. However, it is imperative for elected officials and elected programs to be audited to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse - so if it is not the Inspector General, then it should be granted (if temporarily by ordinance) to the Controller until a more permanent solution is found.

### CRC 27: Ethics Election Prohibition

[Charter](#) | [Ready For Council](#)

Prohibits a member of the Ethics Commission and the Executive Director from running for City office of LAUSD Board office for at least five years following the expiration of the term of office

[§ 700](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Designed to reduce conflicts of interest (or the appearance of them).
- Forms the basis of a model for other potentially "ambition-curbing" positions which are either appointed or elected.
- Interacts with Inspector General position.

**Recommendation:** We approve of this, in keeping with common-sense checks & balances.

## CRC 28: Ethics Independent Counsel

[Charter](#) | [Ready For Council](#)

Authorizes the Ethics Commission to retain its own general counsel, attorneys, and legal support staff that is independent from the City Attorney.

[§ 708](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Interacts with Public Advocate/Bifurcation of the City Attorney.
- Concerns arose as to expense.
- Concerns also about the general phenomenon that the more independent counsels are in a city, the more often the city sues itself.

**Recommendation:** Without independent council, the City Attorney could influence the Ethics Commission for/against other electeds. We approve of this, in keeping with common-sense checks & balances.

## CRC 29: Ethics Commission: Min Budget

[Charter](#) | [Ready For Council](#)

Increases the Ethics Commission's annual minimum appropriation to \$10 million.

[§§711](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Significantly clarifies Council Suspension rules and criteria.
- Suspensions due to conduct unbecoming (for instance, racist language) was considered but ultimately not passed forward due to fears of "chilling effects on free speech" and slippery slopes regarding definitions.
- Suspensions due to ethics violations was not significantly discussed.
- Requiring a council vote was seen as a check against spurious or politically-motivated prosecutions (i.e. fear of federal overreach).
- Interacts with Rodriguez Motion 5/1 that requests a report back clarifying these above suspension rules.

**Recommendation:** We approve of this, in keeping with other "politically unpopular protected budgets".

# Ethics

## CRC 30: $\frac{3}{4}$ Suspension

[Charter](#) | [Minor Adjustments](#)

Allows the Council to suspend any elected officer by a three-fourths vote if charges have been filed and the officer is undergoing felony criminal proceedings, or criminal misdemeanor proceedings related to a violation of official duties; A member of the Council must introduce a Resolution with stated findings of misconduct and shall be heard and voted upon within seven

[§ 211](#)

calendar days of its introduction; No changes to compensation shall be made and the suspension will end if the officer is acquitted

- Significantly clarifies Council Suspension rules and criteria.
- Suspensions due to conduct unbecoming (for instance, racist language) was considered but ultimately not passed forward due to fears of "chilling effects on free speech" and slippery slopes regarding definitions of conduct.
- Suspensions due to ethics violations was not significantly discussed.
- Requiring a council vote was seen as a check against spurious or politically-motivated prosecutions (i.e. fear of federal overreach).
- Interacts with Rodriguez Motion 5/1 that requests a report back clarifying these above suspension rules .

**Recommendation:** We approve of this, in keeping with common-sense checks & balances, as well as simple clarification. We would suggest: report back for when ethics violations rise to the level of removal (i.e. ethics violations impacting elections).

## CRC 31: Caretaker Position

[Charter](#) | [Minor Adjustments](#)

If a Council Member is suspended, the Council may appoint a person as a non-voting manager of the office of the suspended member; a Motion needs to be introduced and heard within seven calendar days regarding the appointment.

§ 211.1 (NEW)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Adds a "Caretaker position" for roles < 1 year, and a special election for terms > 1 year.
- Designed to reduce the amount of time a district remains "unrepresented", and represents a compromise between the cost of calling a special election and needs of representation.
- Interacts with Rodriguez Motion 5/1 that specifies that caretakers are ineligible for election for 5 years.

**Recommendation:** We would strongly disagree with the Rodriguez motion, as limiting the ability of a nominated interim caretaker to be elected by the people for good performance is unduly restrictive. We would suggest: Caretakers are bound by the same statutes by council members for running while occupying a seat (i.e. no using council office staff, funds, etc.)

## CRC 32: Ethics Penalty Increase

[Charter](#) | [Ready For Council](#)

Increases the monetary penalty for an Ethics violation to the greater of \$15,000 for each violation or three times the amount for which the person improperly reported or contributed; adjusts the maximum penalty according to CPI; prohibits the use of campaign funds to pay for violations.

§ 706  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Crucially prohibits use of campaign funds to pay ethics violations.

**Recommendation:** We approve of this, in keeping with common-sense checks & balances.

## CRC 33: Ethics Ballot Measure Submission

[Charter](#) | [Report Back](#)

Authorizes the Ethics Commission to submit ballot measures within their subject matter jurisdiction directly to the voters at the next scheduled City election; any ballot measure shall be presented to the Council which shall hold a public hearing and propose amendments, but shall not directly block Ethics Commission's authority to place measures on the ballot.

[§ 703](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Requested by the Ethics Commission

**Recommendation:** We would suggest this get a procedure similar to 245(e)-esque process, as well as clarifying the language. We believe it is important that this not be tabled due to the nature of the motion, but direct ballot access with little Council influence may be open to abuse.

## CRC 34: LAUSD Contribution Alignment

[Charter Established, Detailed In Admin Code](#) | [Minor Adjustments](#)

Aligns the City's contribution limits with LAUSD adjusted timelines.

[§ 470](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Repeals 470(c)6
- Adds in periodic Ethics Commission review of limitations.
- Otherwise largely an administrative language clean up.

**Recommendation:** The language clean up and built in review by the ethics commission are common sense steps. However, the exact language on Ethics Commission execution is more granular than needs to be in the charter and can be 'as provisioned by ordinance' instead.

## CRC 35: Funding Finance Models

[Charter](#) | [Ready For Council](#)

Removes language referencing matching public funds and adds language that discusses public campaign funding in order to more broadly permit additional public financing models.

[§ 471](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Expands and opens the door to democracy dollars.

**Recommendation:** We are strongly supportive of anything that removes outside donations from local politics.

# Redistricting

## CRC 37: Redistricting Commission Budget, Counsel

[Charter](#) | [Ready For Council](#)

Authorizes the Independent Redistricting Commission to hire separate legal counsel; Includes an annual minimum budget allocation of \$10M for the Independent Redistricting Commission.

[§ 486 and 488](#)  
[CRC Redline](#)

- Both protected budgets and independent counsels were generally controversial at the Reform Commission level.
- However, this was seen as essential to ensure the independence of the IRC.
- Potentially interacts with bifurcation of the city attorney.

**Recommendation:** We approve of this, in keeping with common-sense checks & balances.

# LAUSD

---

## CRC 38: Short Hand

Charter ▾

Ready For Council

Removes several provisions in Section 803 as its relates to LAUSD and adds these references to the Municipal Code

[§803](#)

[CRC Redline](#)

**Recommendation:** This is a minor administrative clean up, and closer to the charter process that is being sought. We would suggest this be passed forward to the council.

:

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Katherine

**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 10:10 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a supporter of Ranked Choice Voting and urge the committee to move forward with it. Our current system has created the nightmare 2 party system, with no hope of a third party candidate making real progress in an election.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Karina Hernandez  
**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 03:25 PM  
**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmembers, My name is Karina and I care deeply about reforms that will reestablish trust between Angelenos and the offices that represent our needs. That is why I am urging you to support the proposal to expand city council to 25 districts (or 25 seats). 1. Expansion would shrink each district's size to about 160,000 residents each and enable each council office to better focus on a smaller set of communities to serve. 2. By removing 100,000 residents from each of your portfolios, we're hopeful that this proposal increases opportunity for residents to feel in closer relationship with your offices. 3. We believe having a smaller district will allow the voices of more marginalized communities to be heard more clearly. 4. The passage of independent redistricting by itself does not solve the problem that districts are just too damn large. We need both independent redistricting AND council expansion to ensure districts that are more representative of all Angelenos. 5. Polling that LA Forward has compiled over the last few years shows favorability of expansion for a majority of likely voters, between the numbers of 23 all the way up to 29. LA is ready for this! 6. If you're worried about implications and implementation details of expansion, remember that you can pass this proposal forward alongside a creation of an ad-hoc or task force like the county has done for Measure G. You can take the next few years to hammer out implementation details before we implement expansion in the early 2030s. Please pass the proposal to expand city council to 25. Thank you! Sincerely, Karina Hernandez North Hollywood, 91602

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shahriar Ghoudsifar

**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 06:53 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a very big proponent of ranked choice voting. I think the LA voters should be able to vote on implementing RCV in an upcoming election. Ranked choice voting is a great step in the direction of improving our electoral process and helping constituents get truly representative elected officials in office. This I believe is the true American way. It will help reduce costs overall by eliminating automatic, runoff elections, and it can help increase positive campaigning versus mudslinging of opponents. Please vote yes for bringing Ranked Choice Voting to the LA Ballot. I live in 90232, in councilmember 5's district.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julia

**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 07:43 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** Ranked choice voting would significantly benefit LA. It would directly address the spoiler effect in crowded races, allowing us to vote for our true preferred candidates without worrying about splitting the vote among similar candidates. Moving to RCV would also drastically reduce negative campaigning. Data shows that candidates in RCV cities are incentivized to find common ground to appeal to others' bases for second choice votes. If La doesn't enact RCV we the taxpayers will continue to have a massive financial tax burden of funding low-turnout primaries. Ultimately, maintaining the status quo as it is now means LA risks electing leaders who do not actually have true majority support which would then o bey exacerbate voter fatigue and political polarization.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Derick Turcios

**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 10:15 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** We need ranked choice voting. Currently, in the LA Mayoral Race, Spencer Pratt, a MAGA republican with no government experience or relevant political background, is a tied 2nd place candidate according to recent polls. But the majority of the electorate does not support him. Regardless, it is very possible that this candidate that a majority of constituents oppose will make it to the runoff against the incumbent. This is ultimately a failure of our election structure. Had voters had ranked choice voting or approval voting, Spencer Pratt would not have been able to bypass our electoral system in this way and a different candidate, one that a majority of voters supported or were comfortable with could have taken that spot instead. If RCV or approval voting passed in LA, voters would finally feel that their voices were actually being heard in our elections and feel that their votes truly do matter. In order to uphold our democracy, we need to reform the systems that betray the majority opinions of voters. RCV or approval voting is the only way to make that possible.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** LIONEL MARES  
**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 10:42 PM  
**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers, I urge you to strongly support ranked choice voting in Los Angeles. Our city's current electoral system no longer reflects the needs of a diverse and growing population, and it fails to fully engage voters across communities. Ranked choice voting offers a meaningful path to reform. It can improve voter participation, reduce the impact of low turnout runoffs, and ensure that elected officials have broader support from the people they serve. At a time when trust in government is fragile, adopting a system that encourages more voices and more choices is essential. Los Angeles deserves an electoral process that is more representative, more efficient, and more responsive to the public. I urge you to move forward with this important reform. Thank you for your leadership and consideration. Sincerely, Lionel Mares, MPA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julio Rodriguez  
**Date Submitted:** 05/20/2026 04:10 PM  
**Council File No:** 26-0489

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmembers, As a LA City resident, I am urging you to support the proposal to expand city council to 25 districts (or 25 seats). The goal of charter reform efforts following 2022's leaked audio tapes has been to rebuild trust in local government. Expansion to 25 districts helps that effort! By removing 100,000 residents from each of your portfolios, we're hopeful that this proposal increases opportunity for residents to feel in closer relationship with your offices. If you're worried about implications and implementation details of expansion, remember that you can pass this proposal forward alongside a creation of an ad-hoc or task force like the county has done for Measure G. You can take the next few years to hammer out implementation details before we implement expansion in the early 2030s. Please pass the proposal to expand city council to 25. Thank you! Thank you, Julio Rodriguez CD 7 Resident