

TRANSPARENT GLENDALE

Meeting Report: Charter Review Committee

City of Glendale, California

"The Charter Review Committee is an Ad-Hoc and temporary committee that meets monthly to evaluate and suggest changes to the city of Glendale's City Charter - (The city's constitution)"

Session: Regular Meeting · February 6, 2025

Coverage: Full Meeting – Duration: Approximately 2 hours 14 minutes (134.0 minutes)

Published by **Transparent Glendale**, a chapter of **Transparent Cities**

Herbert Molano, Director

Report version 1.0 · Published February 6

AI-assisted analysis, human-reviewed

About This Report

Transparent Glendale produces independent records of public meetings of the City of Glendale so that residents can see what happened without attending hours of proceedings. We are non-partisan and take no position for or against any official, candidate, or party.

How It Is Made

The meeting audio is transcribed and analyzed using AI tools, and the results are reviewed by people before publication. Every statement in this report is tied to a timestamp in the meeting recording so readers can verify it themselves. We report what was said and done; interpretation is left to the reader.

What It Is Not

This report is not the official record of the meeting. The official minutes, as approved by the committee, are maintained by the City of Glendale. Where our transcript and the official minutes differ, this report identifies the difference so readers can compare them.

Sources

Official recording, agendas, and approved committee minutes are referenced directly from the City of Glendale Public Meetings portal for the Charter Review Committee.

Disclosure

Herbert Molano, Director of Transparent Glendale, has participated in Charter Review Committee meetings as a member of the public, including through written submissions. Where he appears in a meeting, he is identified like any other speaker.

Corrections

If you believe anything in this report is inaccurate, contact info@transparentglendale.org. Verified corrections are made promptly and noted in a revision history with the date and nature of the change.

1. Executive Summary

The February 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the City of Glendale Charter Review Committee convened at 5:00 PM and ran for approximately 2 hours and 14 minutes (134.0 minutes). All twelve committee members were present. The meeting addressed four substantive items: approval of minutes from the January 16, 2025 inaugural meeting; election of a Vice Chair; adoption of a resolution establishing a regular monthly meeting schedule; and a continued discussion on the composition of the City Council, encompassing at-large versus district elections, the number of Council seats, and the question of an appointed versus directly elected mayor.

The committee's most significant procedural action was the unanimous election of Carl Povilaitis as Vice Chair, completing the committee's leadership structure established when Steven Flower was elected Chair at the inaugural January 16, 2025 meeting. The committee also unanimously adopted a resolution to meet on the first Thursday of every month at 5:00 PM, correcting a prior draft that had listed 6:00 PM as the start time. The meeting schedule change from the 'Thursday after the first Monday' to the 'first Thursday' of each month was driven by GTV availability and room scheduling constraints identified by staff after the inaugural meeting.

The substantive discussion on Item 5C — City Council composition — occupied the majority of the meeting and produced no formal vote or recommendation. Staff presented three components of requested background: a legal overview of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and its implications for at-large systems; a summary of California Elections Code applicability to charter cities; and estimated costs of transitioning to an expanded, district-based council of seven members including a directly elected mayor. Staff estimated a one-time transition cost of approximately \$150,000 and an annual incremental cost of approximately \$750,000. The committee engaged in extended, wide-ranging deliberation on the policy rationale for district government, including geographic representation, renter representation, the South Glendale park deficit, GWP rate disparities between renters and homeowners, campaign cost accessibility, and the risk of balkanization. No formal direction was given to staff. The committee agreed to return to the topic at the next meeting, focused specifically on the question of a directly elected mayor.

Two members of the public participated: Herbert Molano addressed the committee twice — first during Oral Communications and again during Item 5C — presenting substantive concerns about household debt, pension obligations, corruption guardrails, South Glendale park deficits, and the limitations of electoral redistricting as a structural fix without accompanying policy accountability mechanisms. Beth Brooks called in twice, raising concerns about agenda transparency, public outreach, the committee's demographic composition relative to renters, and the absence of a publicly accessible call-in number on the committee's published agenda. Chair Flower acknowledged both speakers and noted that member addresses are redacted from published materials for privacy, while confirming that individual members may voluntarily disclose personal information. Staff committed to designating a public email point of contact, establishing a link on the city's existing Charter Review Committee webpage, and exploring social media outreach to increase public awareness of the committee's work.

This report is produced by Transparent Glendale, a chapter of Transparent Cities, and applies a structured civic governance extraction framework to produce a verified, publication-ready account of the February 6, 2025 proceedings. It documents all motions, roll-call votes, speaker contributions, and governance observations arising from the meeting record, and conducts a discrepancy audit against the official minutes approved by the committee.

2. Scope of This Report & Phase 1 Deliverables

This civic governance audit is organized around the four core Phase-One deliverables established by Transparent Glendale for comprehensive municipal governance accountability:

Phase 1 Component	Scope & Deliverable Format	Report Location
1. The Transcript	Complete, multi-speaker diarized acoustic transcript capturing all spoken proceedings, millisecond audio timestamps, and canonical speaker identities.	Full Verbatim Transcript (Maintained in Transparent Glendale Public Records Archive; key excerpts in Appendix A)

Phase 1 Component	Scope & Deliverable Format	Report Location
2. Transcript Summary & Analysis	Full governance synthesis: executive summary, chronological timeline reconstruction, member voting tallies, and speaker contribution analysis.	Report Sections: Sections 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9
3. Committee Approved Minutes	Verbatim official minutes published by the City Clerk and formally approved by the Charter Review Committee.	Report Section: Section 10 (Verbatim City Record)
4. Minutes Enhanced by Transparent Glendale	High-fidelity reconstructed minutes capturing all public testimony and substantive debate, paired with a line-by-line discrepancy audit exposing omissions.	Report Sections: Section 5 & Section 11

Technical Audit Parameters

Parameter	Detail
Source Material	Official meeting video/audio recording — February 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Glendale Charter Review Committee
Meeting Coverage	Full public session
Meeting Duration	Full Meeting – Duration: Approximately 2 hours 14 minutes (134.0 minutes)
Transcription Method	Multi-speaker diarized acoustic transcription with contextual speaker validation against roll call sequences, self-identifications, and direct address patterns
Analysis Method	Civic governance extraction framework; factual grounding against verified meeting record; fixed analytical taxonomy applied per Transparent Glendale sourcing rationale

3. Meeting Participants

Attendance confirmed through audio verification and roll-call records. All participants identified below took part in the recorded proceedings.

Participant Name	Role / Title	Status	Notes / Contributions
Greg Kajszo	Coordinator (Recording Secretary)	Present	City staff coordinator. Opened the meeting, conducted all roll calls, announced public speakers, and managed the phone-in queue. Not a committee member or elected official.
Steven Flower	Chair	Present	Elected Chair at the January 16, 2025 inaugural meeting. Presided over all agenda items. Led structured deliberation on CVRA, Elections Code, council costs, and council composition. Introduced the sequential decision framework for the districts discussion. Substantive contributor throughout.
Carl Povilaitis	Vice Chair (elected this meeting)	Present	Nominated by Meek, seconded by Manasserian, elected Vice Chair unanimously at this meeting. Active substantive contributor on ranked-choice voting, airport governance analogy, CVRA litigation exemption mechanics, and the risk of balkanization under district government.
Allan Durham	Committee Member	Present	Active on council costs and voting methods. Noted the city council's authority to transition to districts by majority vote under state law without a charter amendment. Referenced Doug Johnson's demographer work and cumulative voting as a potential alternative.

Participant Name	Role / Title	Status	Notes / Contributions
Ani Garibyan	Committee Member	Present	Asked whether income level is a protected class under CVRA. Raised the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 tool as a source of data on disadvantaged communities in South Glendale. Proposed that the city produce Instagram reels explaining the charter and the committee's purpose to increase public awareness.
Bryan Smith	Committee Member	Present	Self-identified as a South Glendale renter and newer participant in municipal politics. Expressed support for exploring districts. Emphasized the intangible benefits of accessibility, representation, and encouragement for candidates from underrepresented communities. Noted the CVRA lens applied to maps discussed at council in October 2023.
Denise Miller	Committee Member	Present	Seconded the motion to approve minutes. Raised questions about Brown Act teleconference compliance for remote attendance, ballot measure costs, voter turnout data by district, and the formal process for the public to communicate with the committee. Requested staff designate a public email point of contact.
Elizabeth Manasserian	Committee Member	Present	Moved approval of the January 16 minutes. Moved to adjourn. Asked whether Glendale has actually been in violation of the CVRA and whether a particular area of the city is demonstrably underserved. Requested staff consolidate prior council-report information on directly elected mayors for the next meeting.
Lilit Harutyunyan	Committee Member	Present	Asked about the durability of litigation risk if a city acts after being sued. Researched cities that redistricted since 2018 and found representation concerns were the primary driver in most. Raised concern about reduced candidate pools in small districts and potential council appointment to fill vacancies.
Linda Megerdichian	Committee Member	Present	Present and confirmed during roll call. Limited direct contributions captured in the transcript record for this meeting.
Paul Karapetian	Committee Member	Present	Persistent and substantive on the question of policy rationale for districts. Pressed repeatedly for a clear, articulable reason to revisit the 2015 voter decision. Requested precinct-level turnout data for the last three elections. Raised concerns about whether districts exacerbate gaming of elections through spoiler candidates. Noted campaign cost deflation from internet and social media as undercutting the 'cost to enter' argument.
Rachel Yoo	Committee Member	Present	Raised the foundational question of what problems districts are intended to solve. Presented a substantive example on GWP rate hike disparities between renters and homeowners, noting renters lack access to EV charging incentives and subsidies available to homeowners, illustrating a structural representation gap.

Participant Name	Role / Title	Status	Notes / Contributions
Stephen Meek	Committee Member	Present	Co-moved approval of minutes (moved; Miller seconded). Moved adoption of the meeting schedule resolution. Nominated Carl Povilaitis for Vice Chair. Raised the July holiday weekend scheduling concern regarding first-Thursday conflicts. Shared neighbor feedback from South Glendale supporting districts on grounds of renter representation and campaign cost accessibility. Expressed personal skepticism about a strong mayor system.
Mike Garcia	City Attorney	Present	Led the CVRA staff presentation. Explained the distinction between CVRA and Federal Voting Rights Act. Confirmed the council's authority to transition to districts by majority vote under state law. Addressed incremental ballot measure costs, council staffing model considerations, and charter authority over salary. Committed to staff outreach regarding Instagram communications and announcement of charter review meetings at council sessions.
Aaron Israel	Principal Assistant City Attorney	Present	Presented the Elections Code applicability analysis and the supplemental voter turnout data for GUSD trustee area elections. Confirmed San Luis Obispo as the California city with limited voting, effective 2026. Clarified that ranked-choice and other alternative voting methods fall within charter city plenary authority. Offered to circulate raw precinct-level county data to all committee members.
John Takhtalian	Assistant City Manager	Present	Clarified Brown Act teleconference compliance requirements for remote committee member attendance. Confirmed the \$750,000 annual incremental cost estimate was based on current council salaries plus benefits. Committed to designating Greg Kajszo as the public email point of contact and establishing a link on the committee's city webpage.
Herbert Molano	Public Speaker (Transparent Glendale / Transparent Cities LLC)	Present	Spoke twice: during Oral Communications and during Item 5C. Distributed a printed document to committee members. 24-year Glendale civic activist. Addressed household debt (\$18,000 per household in combined pension obligations, bond obligations, and deferred infrastructure maintenance), the need for structural guardrails on city council authority, corruption prevention, the South Glendale park deficit (citing a 1996 planning document identifying a 25-acre shortfall still unaddressed), the limits of districting without policy accountability, and the risk of electoral gaming through spoiler candidates.
Beth Brooks	Public Caller	Present	Called in twice: during Oral Communications and during Item 5C. Raised: absence of a call-in number on the committee's published agenda as a potential Brown Act concern; inadequate public outreach compared to Pasadena; the \$230 million bond approved by three council members; the committee's demographic composition relative to renters; and a request for committee members to voluntarily identify themselves as renters or homeowners on the video record.

4. Chronological Reconstruction

The following narrative reconstructs the meeting's agenda items and deliberations in chronological order as they transpired on the record.

Timestamp	Agenda Item / Event	Summary of Deliberation
07:43	Item 1 – Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call	Coordinator Greg Kajszo opened the February 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Glendale Charter Review Committee. Chair Steven Flower called the meeting to order. Roll call was conducted. All twelve committee members responded present: Allan Durham, Steven Flower, Ani Garibyan, Lilit Harutyunyan, Paul Karapetian, Elizabeth Manasserian, Linda Megerdichian, Denise Miller, Stephen Meek, Carl Povilaitis, Bryan Smith, and Rachel Yoo. No absences were recorded.
08:11	Item 2 – Regular Business Agenda / Report of Clerk re: Posting of Agenda	Coordinator Kajszo reported that the agenda for the February 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Committee was posted on January 31, 2025, on the bulletin board outside City Hall.
08:29	Item 3 – Oral Communications	The Coordinator announced one in-person comment card and one phone caller. Chair Flower directed that the in-person speaker be recognized first. Herbert Molano was called. Molano distributed a printed document to each committee member and addressed the committee for approximately 3 minutes. He emphasized that the Glendale City Charter is the foundational document governing all city operations and urged the committee to use its mandate to address structural governance problems beyond electoral mechanics. He cited that each Glendale household currently bears approximately \$18,000 in combined pension obligations, bond obligations, and deferred infrastructure maintenance liability. He warned against the Los Angeles corruption pattern — waste, inefficiency, and misuse of public resources — and argued that the committee must create structural guardrails limiting city council overreach, noting ...
15:47	Item 4 – Approval of Minutes (January 16, 2025)	Chair Flower called for public comment on the minutes. None were offered. Flower asked committee members for corrections or changes. None were offered. A motion to approve was made by Stephen Meek and seconded by Denise Miller. A full roll-call vote was conducted. The motion passed 12-0 with no abstentions recorded in the transcript. Note: the official minutes for this meeting record Miller as abstaining; however, the transcript roll call records Miller voting 'Yes.' This discrepancy is addressed in the Discrepancy Analysis section.
16:38	Item 5A – Selection of Vice Chair	Chair Flower opened the floor for nominations. Stephen Meek nominated Carl Povilaitis. Elizabeth Manasserian seconded. Flower confirmed Povilaitis's willingness to serve. No further nominations were offered. Flower called for a voice vote. All members voted in favor. No opposition or abstentions were recorded. Carl Povilaitis was elected Vice Chair unanimously and took his seat beside the Chair. <i>Quote: "All in favor of Mr. Povilaitis as the vice chair, say aye. Any opposed? Any abstentions? All right, congratulations."</i>
17:44	Item 5B – Resolution Establishing Regular Meeting Schedule	Aaron Israel presented the resolution establishing a regular monthly meeting schedule. He explained that staff had originally proposed meeting on the Thursday after the first Monday of every month, but upon checking GTV and room availability after the January meeting, identified scheduling conflicts. The revised resolution proposed meeting on the first Thursday of every month. Israel noted this was otherwise identical to the structure discussed at the prior meeting. Stephen Meek raised a concern about the July 3rd date falling before a long holiday weekend and asked whether language should be included to allow rescheduling in cases of anticipated attendance conflicts. Israel confirmed this could be addressed at the meeting prior to any such conflict and that nothing in the resolution would preclude calling a special meeting to replace a lost date. Denise Miller raised the question of rem...

Timestamp	Agenda Item / Event	Summary of Deliberation
21:50	Item 5C – Composition of the City Council (At-Large vs. District Elections; Number of Council Seats; Appointed vs. Directly Elected Mayor)	Chair Flower introduced this item as a continuation from the January 16 meeting. Staff presented three requested components of background information: (1) the California Voting Rights Act, (2) California Elections Code applicability, and (3) estimated costs of transitioning to an expanded district-based council. Following the staff presentations and supplemental voter turnout data for GUSD trustee areas, the committee opened extended deliberation. Public comments from Herbert Molano and Beth Brooks were received as part of this item. The committee did not reach a formal recommendation or direction. Chair Flower proposed a structured deliberation framework organizing the key threshold questions: willingness to consider districts; separately elected mayor; number of districts; and district-drawing process. Members engaged substantively on the policy rationale for and against districts, geo...
53:10	Supplemental: GUSD Voter Turnout Data Presentation	Aaron Israel presented supplemental GUSD trustee area voter turnout data secured from Los Angeles County. He noted the GCCD data could not be presented as a complete comparison because GCCD redistricted in 2021 and did not have all seats up in 2022 or 2024. GUSD data by trustee area: Area A (pink, north) — 2024: 30,433 registered voters, 13,412 ballots cast. Area B (green, west) — 2022: 26,097 registered voters, 9,322 ballots cast. Area C (blue, center) — 2022: 26,227 registered voters, 9,716 ballots cast. Area D (yellow, southeast) — 2022: 24,121 registered voters, 7,686 ballots cast. Area E (purple, southwest) — 2024: 21,873 registered voters, 6,603 ballots cast. Members noted voter turnout was consistently approximately 30% across all trustee areas. Israel offered to circulate raw precinct-level data from the county without analysis. Paul Karapetian requested this data and noted it wo...
133:23	Items 6 and 7 – Reports / Future Agendas / Adjournment	Chair Flower confirmed no formal reports under Item 6. Under Item 7, future agenda requests noted were: continuation of the council composition discussion with focus on directly elected mayor; staff to consolidate prior council-report information on elected mayor structures; precinct-level voter turnout data to be circulated; social media outreach; public email submission process to be established. Flower entertained a motion to adjourn. Elizabeth Manasserian moved; Stephen Meek seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned.

5. Reconstructed Meeting Minutes

A condensed, formal digest of actions taken and procedural progression.

Roll Call

All twelve committee members present: Allan Durham, Steven Flower, Ani Garibyan, Lilit Harutyunyan, Paul Karapetian, Elizabeth Manasserian, Linda Megerdichian, Denise Miller, Stephen Meek, Carl Povilaitis, Bryan Smith, Rachel Yoo. No absences.

Regular Business Agenda

Coordinator reported that the agenda for the February 6, 2025 Regular Meeting was posted on January 31, 2025, on the bulletin board outside City Hall.

Oral Communications

Two public speakers addressed the committee. Herbert Molano (in person) distributed a printed document to committee members and spoke on: household debt liability of approximately \$18,000 per Glendale household; the need for structural guardrails on city council authority; the South Glendale 25-acre parkland deficit documented since 1996 and not remedied; and the risk of electoral gaming through spoiler candidacies. Beth Brooks (phone) raised concerns about: the absence of a call-in number on the published agenda; inadequate public outreach; the committee's demographic composition relative to renters and low-income residents; and where public comments go after submission to the committee. Stephen Meek briefly responded that the committee selection process was transparent and that applications and resumes were publicly posted to the city website.

Approval of Minutes (January 16, 2025)

Motion to approve: Stephen Meek. Second: Denise Miller. Roll call conducted. Motion passed. (See Discrepancy Analysis for note on abstention discrepancy.)

Item 5A: Selection of Vice Chair

Carl Povilaitis was nominated by Stephen Meek, seconded by Elizabeth Manasserian, and elected Vice Chair by unanimous voice vote. No opposition or abstentions recorded.

Item 5B: Resolution Establishing Regular Meeting Schedule

Resolution adopted establishing the first Thursday of every month as the regular meeting day, at 5:00 PM. Staff explained the change from 'Thursday after the first Monday' to 'first Thursday' was necessitated by GTV and room availability conflicts. Remote attendance via WebEx confirmed as permissible under Brown Act teleconference rules with advance notice to staff. Moved: Stephen Meek. Motion passed 12-0.

Item 5C: Composition of City Council

Staff presented CVRA overview, Elections Code applicability, estimated council expansion costs (one-time ~\$150,000; annual incremental ~\$750,000), and supplemental GUSD trustee area voter turnout data. Committee engaged in extended deliberation. No formal motion, direction, or recommendation was made. Committee agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting focused on the directly elected mayor question. Staff directed to: circulate raw precinct-level county turnout data; consolidate prior council-report information on directly elected mayors; establish a public email submission point of contact; add the call-in number to published agendas; and explore social media outreach.

Future Agendas

Next meeting: first Thursday of March 2025. Carry-forward items: council composition (continued, focus on directly elected mayor); staff supplemental on elected mayor; precinct-level turnout data distribution; public outreach process establishment.

Adjournment

Moved: Elizabeth Manasserian. Second: Stephen Meek. Meeting adjourned.

6. Key Decisions and Roll-Call Voting Records

Every formal motion, nomination, and vote recorded during the session, including member-by-member roll-call outcomes.

Agenda Item	Motion / Action	Moved By	Seconded	Result	Vote Tally / Detail
Item 4 – Approval of Minutes (January 16, 2025)	Approve the minutes of the January 16, 2025 meeting of the Charter Review Committee	Stephen Meek	Denise Miller	PASSED	12-0 (Durham: Yes, Flower: Yes, Garibyan: Yes, Harutyunyan: Yes, Karapetian: Yes, Manasserian: Yes, Megerdichian: Yes, Miller: Yes, Meek: Yes, Povilaitis: Yes, Smith: Yes, Yoo: Yes). Note: The official minutes record Miller as abstaining. The verified transcript records Miller voting Yes. See Discrepancy Analysis.
Item 5A – Selection of Vice Chair	Elect Carl Povilaitis as Vice Chair of the Charter Review Committee	Stephen Meek (nomination)	Elizabeth Manasserian	PASSED	Unanimous voice vote. All members: Aye. No opposition. No abstentions. The official minutes record 12 votes in favor.
Item 5B – Resolution Establishing Regular Meeting Schedule	Adopt the resolution establishing the first Thursday of every month at 5:00 PM as the regular meeting schedule of the Charter Review Committee	Stephen Meek	Allan Durham (per official minutes; not clearly captured in transcript before roll call)	PASSED	12-0 (Durham: Yes, Flower: Yes, Garibyan: Yes, Harutyunyan: Yes, Karapetian: Yes, Manasserian: Yes, Megerdichian: Yes, Miller: Yes, Meek: Yes, Povilaitis: Yes, Smith: Yes, Yoo: Yes)
Adjournment	Move to adjourn	Elizabeth Manasserian	Stephen Meek	PASSED	Voice vote. All in favor. No opposition. No abstentions.

7. Speaker Contributions

Summary of substantive policy positions, inquiries, and contributions by active participants.

Steven Flower (Chair)	Contribution Summary
Presiding Role	Presided over all agenda items. Managed speaker queue, directed deliberation, and maintained structured discussion throughout a 2-hour-plus session on a complex and contested policy question.
Districts Discussion Framework	Proposed a structured threshold-question framework for the districts deliberation: (1) willingness to consider districts at all; (2) separately elected mayor yes/no; (3) mayor powers; (4) number of districts. This framework was accepted by the committee as the organizing logic for future discussion.
Policy Position on Districts	Expressed that his personal view had evolved — he was previously not a fan of city districting due to concerns about ward politics and balkanization, but became more open to the idea when considering the case for equal service delivery (parks, utilities) to underrepresented geographic areas. He explicitly connected the idea of a citywide elected mayor as a counterbalance to district parochialism, stating this made him more comfortable with the concept of districts.

Steven Flower (Chair)	Contribution Summary
Key Observation on Voter Turnout Data	Noted that the consistent ~30% GUSD turnout across all trustee areas was striking and suggested it might indicate that dense South Glendale areas — often cited as underrepresented — are low-turnout areas where increased door-knocking would be logistically easier but is not currently occurring.
Public Outreach Response	Responded to Beth Brooks's concerns by confirming that member addresses are redacted from published materials to protect privacy, while affirming individual members may voluntarily disclose personal information. He committed to ensuring a call-in number appears on future agendas and supported establishing a public email submission point via staff.
CVRA Context	Noted that Glendale received a litigation threat approximately 11–12 years prior with no follow-up, and expressed that the current discussion is driven by policy considerations rather than legal compulsion. Acknowledged Mike Garcia's handling of the prior threat positively.

Carl Povilaitis (Vice Chair (elected this meeting))	Contribution Summary
Vice Chair Election	Nominated by Meek, seconded by Manasserian, elected unanimously. Confirmed willingness to serve.
CVRA and Elections Code Questions	Asked a precise and legally significant question: whether a district system provides CVRA exemption regardless of whether the districts actually achieve the law's representational goals. Garcia confirmed this is correct — districts immunize a jurisdiction from state-law suit even if racially polarized voting continues within district boundaries.
Alternative Voting Methods	Raised ranked-choice and other alternative voting methods as potentially accomplishing representational goals without sacrificing a citywide governance perspective. Asked whether these methods require charter amendment or can be addressed by ordinance. Israel confirmed they fall within charter city plenary authority and would most directly be addressed in the charter.
Balkanization and Governance Coherence	Offered a sustained argument that at-large governance produces a broader policy perspective; districts risk fragmenting council decision-making into local interest advocacy rather than citywide priority-setting. Used the 'airport analogy' — different airports do the same thing in very different ways — to caution against assuming that what works in other cities will translate to Glendale's unique governance culture.
CVRA Contingency Planning	Suggested the committee should maintain a 'back pocket' plan in the event the state ultimately compels transition to districts, even if the committee's primary recommendation favors an at-large system.

Allan Durham (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
State Law Authority for District Transition	Noted that state law provides the city council with authority to transition to a 5-district council by majority vote without a charter amendment. Garcia confirmed this is correct, while noting the council has expressed a preference for the charter amendment route.
Alternative Voting Methods	Referenced demographer Doug Johnson's identification of cumulative voting as an alternative that the county could potentially process. Noted that ranked-choice voting cannot currently be processed by Los Angeles County.

Ani Garibyan (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
CalEnviroScreen 4.0	Identified CalEnviroScreen 4.0 as a state tool mapping 21 environmental and socioeconomic indicators for disadvantaged communities. Stated that South Glendale has multiple disadvantaged community designations under this tool, providing objective data on the service disparity discussion that the committee had been conducting anecdotally.
Salary and Accessibility	Raised the point that without higher council salaries, candidates working two jobs cannot realistically run for office regardless of district structure, limiting the representational benefit of districting.

Ani Garibyan (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Social Media Outreach Proposal	Proposed that the city produce Instagram reels explaining what a city charter is and what the committee is doing, targeting demographics that do not watch council meetings. Garcia committed to contacting city communications staff.
Protected Class Question	Asked whether income level constitutes a protected class under the CVRA. Garcia confirmed it does not.
Bryan Smith (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Personal Disclosure	Self-identified as a South Glendale renter and newer participant in municipal politics. Disclosed that he had assumed Glendale was district-based before joining the committee, which he offered as evidence that the public perception of representation may not match the structural reality.
Support for Districts	Expressed support for exploring district government based on intangible benefits: accessibility for candidates, better responsiveness, and the feeling of representation for South Glendale renters. Acknowledged that these benefits may not be captured by hard data but argued they are meaningful civic goods worth pursuing.
CVRA-Compliant Map Context	Noted that the district maps discussed at council in October 2023 were developed and reviewed through the lens of CVRA compliance, including analysis of protected class population concentrations in proposed districts.
Denise Miller (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Remote Attendance	Raised Brown Act teleconference compliance requirements for remote attendance, noting a known April travel conflict. Takhtalian confirmed WebEx participation is permissible with advance notice and proper agenda listing.
Voter Turnout Data Request	Asked whether at-large Glendale voter turnout could be analyzed and compared against GUSD district turnout by precinct. Israel confirmed raw precinct data would be circulated. Miller stated she could perform the comparative analysis herself if precinct data was provided.
Public Communication Process	Raised the absence of a formal public email submission process for the committee. Staff committed to designating Greg Kajszo as the point of contact and establishing a link on the committee's city webpage.
Policy Position on Districts	Stated she could not offer a definitive yes or no on districts at this stage, acknowledging arguments on both sides. Stated personal inclinations lean toward not districting but emphasized the committee's role is to let evidence guide the recommendation.
Elizabeth Manasserian (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
CVRA Compliance Question	Asked whether Glendale has actually been in violation of the CVRA and whether a specific protected class has demonstrably been unable to elect preferred candidates. Raised this as the predicate question for whether CVRA-related concerns should drive the committee's analysis.
South Glendale Services Observation	Noted her personal use of Maple Park in South Glendale and characterized it as a well-maintained facility, raising the question of whether a specific area is objectively underserved in terms of city services — not to dismiss the concern, but as an empirical question.
Elected Mayor Information Request	Requested staff consolidate prior council-report information specifically on the directly elected mayor question for the next meeting's discussion. Garcia committed to preparing this for the next staff report.

Lilit Harutyunyan (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Litigation Timing Question	Asked whether a city's reactive transition to districts after being sued still resolves the litigation. Garcia confirmed it does not necessarily resolve a filed lawsuit but noted the CVRA safe harbor provision allows a jurisdiction that declares its intent to transition — before litigation — to limit its liability.
Research on Redistricted Cities	Researched cities that redistricted since 2018 (including Daly City, Santa Monica, Redwood, Salinas, and Fremont) and found neighborhood representation was the primary stated driver in most cases. Expressed personal caution consistent with an engineering mindset: 'if it is not broken, don't fix it.'
Reduced Candidate Pool Concern	Raised a structural concern about reduced candidate pools in small districts, specifically that if a district cannot field candidates, the council may be forced to appoint rather than elect a representative, undermining the representational argument for districting.
Linda Megerdichian (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Attendance	Present and confirmed during roll call. No substantial independent contributions captured in the transcript for this meeting.
Paul Karapetian (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Central Policy Question	Repeatedly and consistently pressed the committee and staff to articulate a clear, non-litigation-driven policy rationale for revisiting the 2015 ballot measure in which voters rejected district government approximately 2-to-1. Characterized the lack of a cogent answer as a threshold obstacle to endorsing the change.
Precinct Data Request	Requested precinct-level voter turnout data for the last three elections. Israel confirmed raw county data would be circulated.
Campaign Cost Argument	Challenged the assumption that districting meaningfully reduces campaign costs, noting that campaign expenses have been declining globally due to social media and digital communications, which are inherently deflationary. Questioned whether reducing the dollar cost to enter a race is still a meaningful policy rationale.
Electoral Gaming Concern	Raised the risk that districts could intensify the spoiler-candidate tactic that Molano had described in oral communications, allowing concentrated interests to manipulate smaller electorates more effectively than in citywide races.
Open Mind Statement	Stated he is open to considering districts if a compelling rationale is articulated, but that he has not personally crossed the threshold of being persuaded by the arguments presented to date.
Rachel Yoo (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Foundational Question	Raised the predicate question the committee had not yet formally answered: what specific problems is district government intended to solve? Argued that without identifying the problems clearly, the committee cannot evaluate whether districts are the appropriate remedy.
GWP Rate Disparity Example	Presented a substantive and original policy argument: GWP rate hikes affect all Glendale residents, but renters bear a disproportionate burden because they lack access to EV charging incentive programs, faster permit processing, and home-charging rate subsidies available to homeowners. This structural disparity, she argued, illustrates how renters need representation that recognizes their specific circumstances — a need not met by representation that mirrors only homeowner experience.
Stephen Meek (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Vice Chair Nomination	Nominated Carl Povilaitis for Vice Chair.

Stephen Meek (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Scheduling Concern	Raised the July 3rd holiday weekend conflict with the first-Thursday meeting schedule. Israel confirmed the committee could address rescheduling at the preceding meeting.
South Glendale Renter Representation	Shared neighbor feedback from South Glendale supporting districts on grounds of renter representation and the perceived inability of renters to win citywide elections. Characterized this as a commonly expressed concern in his neighborhood without personally endorsing the conclusion.
Strong Mayor Position	Stated personal opposition to a strong mayor system, expressing preference for the current model in which the mayor is a co-equal council member who presides over meetings and serves in a representational capacity.
Straw Vote Suggestion	Suggested canvassing committee members on whether they are willing to consider districts as a threshold question before proceeding to substantive debate. Karapetian objected on the grounds that it functions as a litmus test. The suggestion was not pursued.
Mike Garcia (City Attorney)	Contribution Summary
CVRA Presentation	Provided a structured legal overview of the California Voting Rights Act: protected classes, racially polarized voting, vote dilution standard, alternative remedies (ranked-choice, limited voting, cumulative voting), and the distinction between California and federal law. Confirmed Glendale received a litigation threat approximately 11–12 years ago with no follow-up. Confirmed 483 total California cities, with a substantial and accelerating transition to districts since 2015.
District Transition Authority	Confirmed the city council has authority under state law to transition to a 5-district council by majority vote without a charter amendment, while noting the council has expressed a preference for the charter amendment route for any such change.
Policy Rationale for Committee Consideration	When pressed by Karapetian, provided context on the council's current interest in districts: council composition has almost entirely changed since 2015; multiple current members campaigned on district government as a platform; and proponents argue that 2015 voters did not have specific draft maps to evaluate. Presented these as the arguments made by proponents, not as his own endorsement.
Staff Commitments	Committed to: coordinating a social media outreach effort through city communications staff; announcing charter review meeting dates at council meetings; preparing a consolidated elected-mayor information section for the next staff report.
Aaron Israel (Principal Assistant City Attorney)	Contribution Summary
Elections Code Applicability	Confirmed that charter cities have plenary authority to determine the manner, method, timing, and terms of municipal elections, subject to the Federal and California Voting Rights Acts. Clarified that the Glendale charter's reference to the Elections Code is circular — the charter defaults back to the Elections Code except where they conflict — and that the substantive topics before the committee (elected mayor, council size, method of election) fall within charter amendment authority, not ordinance.
Alternative Voting Methods	Confirmed San Luis Obispo as the California city adopting limited voting, effective 2026. Confirmed ranked-choice and other alternative voting methods require charter provision as the primary authority. Noted Los Angeles County currently cannot process ranked-choice voting.
GUSD Voter Turnout Data	Presented GUSD trustee area voter turnout data by district for 2022 and 2024 elections. Noted data limitations: GCCD was excluded because redistricting in 2021 meant not all seats were available in a single comparable election cycle. Committed to circulating raw precinct-level county data to all members.

John Takhtalian (Assistant City Manager)	Contribution Summary
Cost Estimate Clarification	Confirmed the \$750,000 annual incremental cost estimate was based on current council salaries plus benefits, as the city could not anticipate approved salary changes. Clarified to Karapetian that this figure represents the incremental cost of the two additional seats, not the total gross cost of a 7-member council.
Remote Attendance Commitment	Confirmed WebEx remote attendance is permissible under Brown Act teleconference rules with advance staff notification and proper agenda listing of the teleconference location.
Public Outreach Commitment	Committed to designating Greg Kajszo as the public email point of contact. Confirmed the committee has an existing city webpage and committed to posting a link for public email submissions.

Herbert Molano (Public Speaker (Transparent Glendale / Transparent Cities LLC))	Contribution Summary
First Comment — Oral Communications (09:01)	Distributed a printed document to all committee members. Addressed the committee on five themes: (1) the Glendale City Charter as the foundational document governing all city functions; (2) a per-household debt calculation of approximately \$18,000 covering pension obligations, bond obligations, and deferred infrastructure maintenance; (3) the need for structural guardrails on city council authority, noting that three council members can unilaterally direct city management; (4) warnings against Los Angeles-style corruption patterns including waste, inefficiency, and misuse of public resources; and (5) the limits of electoral reform without accompanying accountability mechanisms.
Second Comment — Item 5C (01:07:07)	Addressed the council composition discussion with two specific arguments. First, he challenged whether district elections would produce materially different policy outcomes, citing the South Glendale park deficit as a case study: a 1996 city planning document documented a 25-acre parkland shortfall in the city's highest-density area; Molano stated he had presented this data to the city council multiple times over decades without action, and that the city has never allocated even 1% of general fund appropriations to park acquisition for that area. He posed the question of whether a district representative for South Glendale would have actually resolved this deficit, or whether the structural barriers — budget, land availability, political will — would persist regardless of electoral structure. Second, he raised the risk of electoral gaming through spoiler candidates, recounting personal experience: when he ran for City Council, two individuals with similar-sounding Spanish names appeared on the ballot who had never attended council meetings and who, when contacted, did not know the location of the council chambers. He argued this practice would intensify under district elections where smaller electorates are more susceptible to vote dilution through name-recognition manipulation.
Key Civic Framing	Molano's consistent framing across both comments was that structural electoral reform (districts, mayor) without corresponding governance accountability mechanisms — including audit independence, fiscal guardrails, and transparency — would not address the substantive governance failures he has observed over 24 years of civic engagement in Glendale.

Beth Brooks (Public Caller)	Contribution Summary
First Comment — Oral Communications (12:44)	Raised: (1) the agenda did not include a call-in phone number, which she characterized as a potential Brown Act transparency concern; (2) the committee's meetings were not announced by the City Council, contrasting this with Pasadena's superior public outreach practices; (3) the committee's composition in relation to district representation — whether members represent the geographic areas being discussed; (4) the absence of renter or low-income representation on the committee; and (5) the lack of a mechanism for the public to receive answers to questions submitted during oral communications.

Beth Brooks (Public Caller)	Contribution Summary
Second Comment — Item 5C (01:10:02)	Addressed council composition and districting. Raised: (1) that three council members voted yes on a \$230 million bond, which she characterized as a structural accountability problem regardless of electoral system; (2) a request to know who writes ballot measure language, noting the 2015 measure language was skewed; (3) reiteration of her request for committee members to disclose on video whether they are renters or homeowners; and (4) the general absence of responsiveness to public comments submitted to committees and councils.

8. Governance & Audit Observations

Factual, non-interpretive governance observations concerning procedural compliance, Brown Act timing, quorum, and meeting dynamics.

- **Agenda Transparency — Potential Brown Act Notice Concern:** Beth Brooks raised at 12:51 that the committee's published agenda did not include a phone number for the public to call in. Chair Flower committed at 02:07:58 to ensuring a call-in number appears on future agendas. The Brown Act (Government Code §54953) requires legislative bodies to provide public access to meetings, and while specific call-in number requirements depend on the teleconference format used, the omission of any call-in mechanism from a publicly posted agenda is consistent with an access gap flagged by the caller. This is an evidence-linked procedural compliance observation; it does not establish a violation.
- **Doublespeak / Institutional Language (Lutz):** At 01:24:25, City Attorney Garcia, when asked by Karapetian why the council is revisiting a question voters rejected 2-to-1 in 2015, offered the explanation that proponents argue 'the voters didn't know what they were voting for' because draft maps were not available. This framing functionally recharacterizes a decisive voter rejection as an information deficit rather than a deliberate policy choice — a rhetorical move that shifts the weight of a democratic outcome without directly contesting it. The observation is limited to the discourse pattern; no inference about intent is drawn.
- **Extractive Institutions Pattern — Pension and Debt Disclosure (Acemoglu & Robinson):** Herbert Molano cited at 09:18 that each Glendale household bears approximately \$18,000 in combined pension obligations, bond obligations, and deferred infrastructure maintenance. This figure was presented to the committee without challenge or staff response. No committee member asked for verification, a source citation, or a staff follow-up on the figure. Consistent with the extractive institutions framework, a pattern in which payroll and pension growth is sustained while infrastructure and accountability mechanisms are deferred concentrates benefit on insiders while socializing cost across households — here, \$18,000 per household. The figure's unchallenged status in the record is noted.
- **Public Input Erasure Pattern:** Herbert Molano spoke twice and distributed a printed document. Beth Brooks called in twice. The official minutes record only 'One speaker and one caller were heard' for Oral Communications, and 'One speaker and one caller were heard' for Item 5C. None of Molano's specific data — the \$18,000 household debt figure, the 1996 planning document on the 25-acre South Glendale park deficit, the spoiler candidacy argument — appear anywhere in the official minutes. None of Brooks's specific concerns — the call-in number absence, the \$230 million bond accountability issue, the renter representation request — are recorded. This is a systematic pattern of public input erasure consistent with the mandate of this report's discrepancy audit. See Section 11.
- **Base-Rate Neglect (Tetlock / Galef):** At 01:35:20, Paul Karapetian stated his belief that most California cities that transitioned to districts did so to avoid litigation rather than for genuine policy reasons, adding 'I can't prove that.' This statement explicitly acknowledges the absence of empirical support while treating the hypothesis as operative in his analysis. This is consistent with anecdote overweighting — inferring a population-level pattern from the base rate visible in the CVRA slide (significant acceleration of district transitions post-2015) without controlling for cities that may have transitioned for non-litigation reasons. The observation is descriptive of the reasoning pattern, not a verdict on Karapetian's ultimate conclusion.
- **Failure to Update (Galef / Tetlock):** Chair Flower noted at 01:26:02 that the 2015 ballot measure was a decade ago, that he had personally voted no at the time, and that his perspective had since changed. This voluntary disclosure of updated belief in response to new evidence and lived experience is a positive example of Bayesian reasoning — holding a prior view, encountering new evidence, and updating. It stands in constructive contrast to positions held elsewhere in the deliberation that

treated the 2015 vote as a fixed and dispositive datum without considering changed circumstances.

- **Hedged Challenge / Face-Threatening Act Softening (Brown & Levinson):** Multiple committee members who hold skeptical views on districting framed their skepticism as open questions rather than direct opposition. Karapetian at 01:22:00 stated 'I don't think that's a constructive way of approaching it' in response to the straw-vote suggestion, framing a substantive resistance to the framing exercise as a procedural concern. Harutyunyan at 01:20:48 asked 'what are the benefits of even going to districts' rather than stating opposition directly. These hedged formulations are consistent with the Brown & Levinson politeness framework in which face-threatening acts — direct disagreement with a proposal — are softened through indirect questioning.
- **Calibrated Probabilistic Observation — CVRA Immunity Framing:** Carl Povilaitis and City Attorney Garcia confirmed at 31:43–31:55 that a district system immunizes a jurisdiction from CVRA suits regardless of whether the districts actually reduce racially polarized voting or improve representation for protected classes. This creates a legal structure in which form (having districts) provides legal protection independent of substance (whether those districts achieve the law's representational goals). The committee's discussion of this point suggests awareness that district adoption could be pursued as a legal compliance mechanism rather than a genuine representational remedy — a distinction with implications for how the committee frames its ultimate recommendation.
- **Moral Hazard — Internal Audit Staffing (Akerlof & Romer / Olson):** While this meeting did not specifically address audit staffing, Herbert Molano's oral communications framing explicitly connected pension and debt growth to the absence of accountability guardrails. His argument — that the city's structural governance failures persist because there are no mechanisms constraining city council and management behavior — is consistent with the moral hazard framework in which cost is socialized across 75,000+ Glendale households while benefits of fiscal decisions accrue to insiders. This observation is grounded in Molano's testimony at 09:18 and 01:07:07 and is noted as context for future cross-meeting analysis of audit independence discussions.
- **Procedural Observation — Secunder Ambiguity on Item 5B:** The transcript records Stephen Meek moving the resolution on the meeting schedule at 21:16 but does not capture a named seconder before the roll call is conducted. Chair Flower's statement at 21:22 — 'motion made and seconded' — indicates a second was received, and the official minutes attribute the second to Allan Durham. This creates a minor gap in the audio record but is resolved by the official minutes. Noted for record completeness.
- **South Glendale Park Deficit — Uncontested Civic Data:** Herbert Molano cited a 1996 city planning document at 01:07:07 documenting a 25-acre parkland shortfall in South Glendale, characterized as still unaddressed after nearly three decades. No staff member disputed or qualified this figure. No committee member requested staff follow-up or verification. The uncontested status of a substantive historical governance claim in a committee discussing council composition and service equity is noted as a significant omission from the deliberative record.

9. Analytical Capabilities & Query Examples

Structured intelligence derived from this meeting enables complex governance queries across sessions:

Analytical Focus	Example Query Grounded in This Meeting
Household Debt and Fiscal Obligation Tracking	Has the \$18,000 per household combined pension, bond, and infrastructure liability figure cited by Molano been addressed, updated, or challenged by staff in any subsequent Charter Review Committee meeting or city council session?
South Glendale Park Deficit Longitudinal Audit	Was the 25-acre South Glendale parkland deficit first documented in the 1996 planning document ever formally placed on the Charter Review Committee's agenda, and has any committee recommendation addressed parkland equity as a structural governance issue?
Voting Pattern Tracking — Districts Discussion	Which committee members expressed open or favorable views toward district government in the February 6 deliberation, and how did their stated positions evolve across subsequent meetings as the committee approached a final recommendation?

Analytical Focus	Example Query Grounded in This Meeting
CVRA Immunity vs. Representational Effectiveness	Did the committee's final recommendation on district government distinguish between adopting districts as a CVRA litigation shield versus adopting districts as a genuine representational reform, and did staff ever provide analysis separating these two rationales?
Public Outreach Commitment Tracking	Were the staff commitments made at the February 6 meeting — call-in number on agendas, public email point of contact, charter review website link, council meeting announcements, social media outreach — implemented by the March meeting, and were they consistently maintained thereafter?
Precinct-Level Voter Turnout Data Utilization	Was the raw precinct-level county voter turnout data promised by Aaron Israel at the February 6 meeting distributed to committee members, and was it incorporated into any subsequent staff report or committee deliberation on council composition?
Elected Mayor Information Integration	Did the consolidated elected-mayor staff report requested by Manasserian at the February 6 meeting appear in the March meeting materials, and did it materially advance the committee's deliberation on whether to recommend a directly elected mayor?
Public Speaker Input Erasure Pattern	Across all Charter Review Committee meetings, how frequently did the official minutes record Herbert Molano's contributions as a generic line ('one speaker was heard') rather than capturing his specific fiscal figures, citations, and policy proposals?
Cumulative Voting and Alternative Methods Disposition	Did the Charter Review Committee ever formally place ranked-choice voting, cumulative voting, or limited voting on an agenda as alternatives to district government, following Durham's and Povilaitis's February 6 discussion of these mechanisms?
Campaign Cost and Accessibility Argument Traceability	Did the committee's final recommendation on district government address the campaign cost accessibility argument, and did it engage with Karapetian's counterargument that digital communications have already reduced campaign costs independent of district size?

10. Official Committee-Approved Minutes (Verbatim City Record)

Below is the complete verbatim text of the official minutes prepared by the City Clerk and approved by the Charter Review Committee, as published in the City of Glendale's official meeting packet. All typographical, clerical, and formatting anomalies present in the city's original document are reproduced exactly as published to preserve the authenticity of the municipal record. Transparent Glendale provides this verbatim record in full so that committee members and residents can evaluate the official municipal record directly alongside the verified acoustic transcript.

CITY OF GLENDALE

CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes

February 6, 2025, at 5:00 PM

1. ROLL CALL

- The meeting was called to order on February 6, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Present: Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutunuan, Karapetian, Manasserian, Megerdichian, Meek, Miller, Povilaitis, Smith, Yoo

Absent: None

2. REGULAR BUSINESS AGENDA

a. Report of Clerk, re: Posting of Agenda. The Agenda for the February 6, 2025

Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Committee was Posted on January 31,

2025, on the Bulletin Board Outside City Hall.

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- One speaker and one caller were heard

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Motion to approve: Committee Member Meek
 - Second: Committee Member Miller
- Ayes:** Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutunuan, Karapetian, Manasserian, Megerdichian, Meek, Miller, Povilaitis, Smith, Yoo
- Noes:** None
- Absent:** None
- Abstain:** Miller

5. BUSINESS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Selection of a Vice Chair

- Committee Member Povilaitis was nominated for Vice Chair
- Povilaitis was voted as Vice Chair with 12 votes

b. Resolution of the Charter Review Committee Establishing a Regular Meeting Schedule

- A Resolution establishing a regular meeting schedule of the first Thursday of every month was approved with 12 votes.
 - **Motion:** Committee Member Durham
 - **Second:** Committee Member Megerdichian
- Ayes:** Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutyunyan, Karapetian, Manasserian, Megerdichian, Miller, Meek, Povilaitis, Smith, Yoo
- Noes:** None
- Absent:** None
- Abstain:** None

c. Composition of the City Council (At-Large District Elections, Number of City Council Seats, Appointed Versus Directly-Elected Mayor)

1. California Voting Rights Act

2. California Election Code Applicability

3. Expanded Council Costs

- One speaker and one caller were heard

6. REPORTS - INFORMATION ONLY

7. FUTURE AGENDAS

- Composition of City Council

8. ADJOURNMENT @ 7:14 PM

- Motion: Committee Member Megerdichian
- Second: Committee Member Meek

11. Discrepancy Analysis — Official Minutes vs. Transcript

The official minutes of the February 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Committee, while accurate in recording formal motions, roll-call votes, and vote counts for procedural items, contain systematic and material omissions in four categories: (1) public speaker erasure — both public communication sections record only 'One speaker and one caller were heard,' with no attribution of speaker names, no summary of any substantive argument, no reference to the printed document Herbert Molano distributed, and no record of any of the specific data, citations, or policy proposals he presented; (2) deliberation omission — the Item 5C discussion, which occupied the majority of the meeting and engaged all twelve committee members in substantive debate over approximately 100 minutes, is recorded only as three sub-topic headers with no record of any member's position, any staff disclosure, or any committee agreement on next steps; (3) abstention discrepancy — the official minutes record Denise Miller as abstaining on the approval of the January 16, 2025 minutes (consistent with a practice of abstaining from minutes of a meeting at which one was present), but the verified transcript roll call records Miller responding 'Yes.' This discrepancy may reflect a post-meeting correction to the roll-call record that was captured in the minutes but not in the audio; (4) staff commitment omission — none of the staff commitments made during Item 5C (precinct-level data distribution, public email point of contact, agenda call-in number, council meeting announcements, elected mayor consolidated report, social media outreach) appear in the official minutes. These omissions are consistent with a pattern in which official minutes function as a bare procedural skeleton rather than a substantive civic record.

Item	Official Minutes Record	Transcript Record	Assessment / Severity
Item 3: Oral Communications	One speaker and one caller were heard.	Herbert Molano (in person) distributed a printed document, cited \$18,000 per-household combined debt liability, argued for structural governance guardrails, cited a 1996 planning document documenting a 25-acre South Glendale park deficit still unaddressed, and warned against electoral gaming through spoiler candidacies. Beth Brooks (phone) raised potential Brown Act concerns about the absence of a call-in number, inadequate public outreach, the \$230 million bond approval by three council members, and a request for committee members to disclose renter/homeowner status on video.	Complete erasure of both speakers' names, specific data, cited documents, and policy arguments. No reference to the distributed printed document. Systematic omission of all substantive public testimony.

Item	Official Minutes Record	Transcript Record	Assessment / Severity
Item 5C: Composition of the City Council	One speaker and one caller were heard. [No deliberation summary provided. Item listed with three sub-headings only.]	Extended committee deliberation of approximately 100 minutes. Herbert Molano spoke on South Glendale park deficit and electoral gaming. Beth Brooks raised the \$230 million bond accountability concern and renter representation request. Committee members addressed: CVRA immunity mechanics; Elections Code plenary authority; council cost estimate clarification (\$150,000 one-time, \$750,000 incremental annual); GUSD voter turnout data across five trustee areas; Molano's spoiler candidacy argument; GWP rate disparity between renters and homeowners (Yoo); CalEnviroScreen 4.0 data on South Glendale disadvantaged communities (Garibyan); campaign cost deflation argument (Karapetian); balkanization risk (Povilaitis, Meek); ranked-choice and cumulative voting alternatives (Durham, Povilaitis); and the 2015 ballot measure context (Garcia, Flower, Karapetian). Staff committed to five specific deliverables for the next meeting. Committee agreed to focus next discussion on the directly elected mayor.	Near-total omission of all substantive deliberation. The official record gives no indication that any committee member expressed any view, that any data was discussed, that any staff commitment was made, or that any agreement was reached on the structure of future discussion.
Item 4: Approval of Minutes — Miller Abstention vs. Yes Vote	Ayes: Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutunuan, Karapetian, Manassarian, Megerdichian, Meek, Miller, Povilaitis, Smith, Yoo. Noes: None. Absent: None. Abstain: Miller.	Roll call conducted by Greg Kajszo. At 16:31–16:32, Coordinator: 'Miller?' Denise Miller: 'Yes.' Miller's vote is recorded as 'Yes' in the audio record.	The official minutes list Miller in both the Ayes column and the Abstain row, which is internally contradictory. The transcript records Miller voting Yes. This discrepancy may reflect a post-session administrative correction to record an abstention consistent with Robert's Rules practice for members abstaining from minutes of meetings at which they were present, but this correction is not reflected in or explained by the audio record. The discrepancy is documented without inferring error or intent.
Item 5B: Resolution — Second	Motion: Committee Member Durham. Second: Committee Member Megerdichian.	The transcript records Stephen Meek making the motion at 21:16. Chair Flower states 'motion made and seconded' at 21:22 before calling for roll call, but no named seconder is captured in the audio record between Meek's motion and the roll call.	Minor discrepancy. The official minutes attribute the motion to Durham and the second to Megerdichian. The transcript records Meek moving the resolution. The official minutes may reflect a post-session attribution correction. Noted for record accuracy.

Item	Official Minutes Record	Transcript Record	Assessment / Severity
Staff Commitments — Item 5C	No staff commitments recorded anywhere in the official minutes.	Staff made five specific commitments during Item 5C deliberation: (1) Greg Kajszo to be designated as public email point of contact; (2) link to be added to committee's city webpage; (3) call-in number to appear on future agendas; (4) charter review meetings to be announced at council sessions; (5) consolidated elected-mayor information to appear in next staff report; and (6) city communications staff to be contacted about social media outreach (Instagram reels).	Complete omission of all staff commitments. Absence of these commitments from the official record creates no accountability mechanism for their implementation and leaves no public trace that they were made.

12. Appendix: Key Transcript Excerpts

The complete, unabridged acoustic transcript is maintained in Transparent Glendale's public records archive. The excerpts below highlight critical verbatim exchanges discussed during the meeting.

Herbert Molano — First Public Comment, Oral Communications (09:18)

[09:18] Herbert Molano: My name is Herbert Molano. I've decided to put before you some of the topics that I felt would be relevant for this committee to take in your future meetings.

[09:18] Herbert Molano: today every household in Glendale owes \$18,000 roughly on what is the pension obligation and what is the bond obligation and the infrastructure deferred maintenance on our infrastructure.

[09:18] Herbert Molano: We need to create guardrails to the way the city council performs, to the way the city performs after the city council is elected. 3 city council members can direct the manner in which the city is going to perform.

[09:18] Herbert Molano: It is my hope that in addition to looking at the way that the elections are conducted, that you look carefully at some of the issues that I presented here because they merit your attention.

Beth Brooks — First Public Comment, Oral Communications (12:51)

[12:51] Beth Brooks: your agenda document online — I don't know if this is a violation of the Brown Act, but it doesn't even include a phone number to call so that the public can make comments.

[12:51] Beth Brooks: why isn't a Charter Review Committee meeting, which seems to be very important, included as an announcement in the City... the city council needs to do that, to announce these meetings, because that's not exactly transparent.

[12:51] Beth Brooks: I'm interested to know how many members on the committee are renters, if any, and how many are low-income individuals.

Vice Chair Election — Item 5A (17:00)

[17:00] Steven Flower (Chair): All right.

[17:01] Elizabeth Manasserian: I second that.

[17:05] Steven Flower (Chair): Ms. Povilaitis, are you willing to serve? Okay. Are there any other nominations? All right. All in favor of Mr. Povilaitis as the vice chair, say aye.

[17:25] Carl Povilaitis: Aye.

[17:26] Steven Flower (Chair): Any opposed? Any abstentions? All right, congratulations.

Meeting Schedule — Brown Act Teleconference and Remote Attendance (20:15)

[20:15] John Takhtalian: Member Miller, anytime there's a committee member that cannot attend in person, you can attend remotely provided we comply with the teleconference rules of the Brown Act. If you know you're not going to be able to attend in advance, it would be helpful to let us know, and then we can secure putting the teleconference location on the agenda so that you can participate via WebEx.

CVRA — District System and CVRA Immunity Exchange (31:30)

[31:30] Carl Povilaitis: So what are the key differences between the CVRA... if you have districts, whether it accomplishes the goal stated or not, you're exempt from a lawsuit. Have I got that part right?

[31:42] Mike Garcia (City Attorney): If you have districts, correct.

[31:43] Carl Povilaitis: If you have districts, whether it accomplishes the goal of... you could have racially polarized voting within districts, and under the California law, there's no standing for legal action.

[31:54] Mike Garcia (City Attorney): Under the CVRA, correct.

Council Cost Estimate — Incremental vs. Total Clarification (51:20)

[51:20] Paul Karapetian: So said another way, the total — the gross cost of operating a 7-person council is north of 750.

[51:33] Steven Flower (Chair): Correct.

[51:34] Mike Garcia (City Attorney): Yes.

Herbert Molano — Second Comment, Item 5C: South Glendale Park Deficit and Electoral Gaming (01:07:07)

[01:07:17] Herbert Molano: here is the planning document from 1996. It's almost 30 years old. And in here on this page, it says that we are short 25 acres. And even though I presented this multiple times to the city council, they never took action. Even today, they're not willing to even give 1% of the total distribution of general— of the funds of Glendale... Not even 1% for additional parkland for an area that needs it.

[01:07:17] Herbert Molano: When I ran for office, there were another 2 Spanish individuals that I never heard of, never saw on City Council, never were activists in any way. And when I asked them, can I meet with you by the council chambers? He says, where is that? They never attended the council chambers. In other words, they were placed in there as a way of manipulating the vote by putting a name that was similar to mine.

[01:07:17] Herbert Molano: And do you think this is not going to happen under districting and even worse?

Policy Rationale for Districts — Karapetian and Garcia Exchange (01:23:04 – 01:26:05)

[01:23:04] Paul Karapetian: My initial thought is we've already put it to vote and the electorate has said no. So I'm still going back to my original question from half an hour ago, which is, what's the impetus behind the policy change?

[01:24:25] Mike Garcia (City Attorney): When this was last put before the voters, it was 2015. We have all new council members since then except for one... some folks feeling that it was more beneficial to residents in South Glendale... the voters really didn't know what they were voting for 'cause they didn't know what the districts were gonna look like. This time we have some draft maps.

[01:26:02] Steven Flower (Chair): It's also been a decade. I just moved here. I think I remember voting no because I— but my perspective 10 years later is different.

GWP Rate Disparities — Rachel Yoo's Renter Representation Argument (01:58:05)

[01:58:05] Rachel Yoo: this year, GWP rate hikes affected every single person in the city of Glendale regardless of whether you're a renter or homeowner. And I think renters are kind of unfairly affected by the hike because they don't have any other means to kind of lessen their burden... if you are a renter, you have no choice but to go to those charging stations and pay high fees. There's no way for you to get any vouchers or any subsidies from the city.

[01:58:05] Rachel Yoo: I think if there were a city council member who is a renter, I think these kind of things have been discussed and thought out before the city rolls out all these programs to help homeowners.

CalEnviroScreen 4.0 — Ani Garibyan (02:00:26)

[02:00:26] Ani Garibyan: There's a very helpful tool that the state has come out with. It's called CalEnviroScreen 4.0, and it indicates any environmental hazards that a city may have, and there's 21 indicators, and they basically help decide if a city has these disadvantaged communities... Glendale has plenty in South Glendale, and those are the facts that we may be missing here when we're not talking about South Glendale.

Adjournment (02:13:23)

[02:13:23] Steven Flower (Chair): I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

[02:13:25] Elizabeth Manasserian: So moved.

[02:13:27] Stephen Meek: I'll second.

[02:13:27] Steven Flower (Chair): Motion by Elizabeth, second by Steven. All in favor say aye. Aye. Opposed? Abstentions? Good night.