

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 · March 6, 2025

Coverage: Full Meeting – Duration: Approximately 2 hours 19 minutes (139.2 minutes)

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

Herbert Molano, Director

Report version 1.0 · Published March 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 March 6, 2025 meeting of the Glendale Charter Review Committee convened at 5:00 PM and ran for approximately 2 hours and 19 minutes. All twelve committee members were present. The meeting was presided over by Chair Steven Flower, with Carl Povilaitis serving as Vice Chair. The sole substantive agenda item — Item 6A, Composition of the City Council — encompassed the committee's continued deliberation on three interrelated constitutional questions: at-large versus district-based elections, the number of council seats, and whether Glendale should transition to a directly elected mayor. No binding votes were taken on any substantive question. The session functioned as a structured exploration of mayoral models, powers, and structural implications, building on the prior meeting's foundational district discussion.

The committee received a staff presentation delivered by John Takhtalian (Assistant City Manager) recapping four directly elected mayor models drawn from California council-manager cities: the common equal-voice-and-vote model, the Long Beach model (veto without vote), the Bakersfield model (tie-breaking vote only), and the Riverside/San Bernardino model (tie-breaking vote plus veto). City Attorney staff — Lucy Varpetian and Aaron Israel — provided legal guidance on Brown Act implications, the limits of mayoral policy authority, board and commission appointment dynamics, emergency powers, and term limits jurisprudence. Jack Takhtalian separately confirmed that the city's website had been modified to enable public comment submission prior to meetings.

Two members of the public addressed the committee during Oral Communications. Herbert Molano, a 24-year Glendale civic activist representing Transparent Glendale, delivered a data-grounded presentation supported by a printed handout, documenting a 30-year documented park deficit in South Glendale affecting approximately 27,000 residents, decades of unaddressed road deterioration, and the structural governance failures underlying both. Chris Welch, a 26-year Adams Hill resident, advocated for six district-based elections and an at-large elected mayor, citing South Glendale's persistent underrepresentation on the council. Molano also spoke during the Future Agendas item, proposing that the committee examine cities already operating under the charter models under consideration to gather real-world governance performance evidence.

The committee reached informal consensus on the following mayoral parameters: a directly elected mayor should serve as presiding officer; should have equal voice and equal vote on all matters before the council; should not possess veto power; should not have unilateral appointment authority over boards and commissions; and should not be inserted into the city's existing emergency chain of command. Matters deferred to the next meeting include term length and term limits for a directly elected mayor, the permissibility of a termed-out mayor transitioning directly to a council seat, campaign contribution limits in the context of district elections, and a structured framework for reaching formal consensus votes on council composition. No votes were taken on any substantive item.

Several governance observations are documented in this report. The most significant includes the disclosure by John Takhtalian that once a charter amendment reaches the ballot, the city is legally prohibited from engaging in advocacy around it and is restricted to informational outreach — a constraint that Denise Miller directly linked to her concern that public awareness of the reform effort has been inadequate. Chair Steven Flower echoed this observation, noting that public awareness of the district question has been markedly lower than awareness of minor municipal matters such as trash can changes. Committee Member Denise Miller offered the meeting's most substantively detailed intervention, drawing on her research into all council deliberation videos to propose a concrete, project-managed outreach strategy including timeline recommendations and consultant-direction parameters. The committee's awareness of the absolute June 2026 ballot deadline — and the staffing and timeline work required to meet it — was explicitly raised and acknowledged.

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)
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 — March 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Glendale Charter Review Committee
Meeting Coverage	Full public session
Meeting Duration	Full Meeting – Duration: Approximately 2 hours 19 minutes (139.2 minutes)
Transcription Method	Multi-speaker diarized acoustic transcription with contextual validation
Analysis Method	Civic governance extraction framework; factual grounding against verified meeting record

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 roll call, announced agenda items and speakers. Not a committee member or elected official.
Steven Flower	Chair	Present	Elected Chair. Presided over all agenda items. Led discussion on mayoral models, district data analysis, and public awareness. Requested precinct-level voting data for four elections and shared preliminary findings. Raised campaign contribution limits as a future agenda topic.
Carl Povilaitis	Vice Chair	Present	Elected Vice Chair. Active contributor on mayoral veto power, district implications for rotation, and Glendale's scale relative to strong-mayor governments. Moved adjournment. Noted civil service and finance charter provisions as additional upcoming agenda topics.

Participant Name	Role / Title	Status	Notes / Contributions
Allan Durham	Committee Member	Present	Active contributor on board and commission appointment mechanics, ballot mapping requirements, precinct data clarification, and the agenda-setting role of the current mayor. Clarified for Committee Member Yoo that current board listings are transitional and not yet reflective of the new dual-panel appointment system.
Denise Miller	Committee Member	Present	Substantial contributor throughout. Offered detailed project-management framing for the committee's remaining timeline and outreach strategy. Expressed concern about the adequacy of prior public engagement. Noted she had reviewed all prior council deliberation videos. Distinguished between council's ordinance-style deliberation and the ballot-vote nature of charter amendment. Moved adjournment second.
Elizabeth Manasserian	Committee Member	Present	Raised questions on mayoral budget authority, the correlation between South Glendale voting patterns and representation arguments, and the utility of precinct-level election results data. Moved minutes approval.
Ani Garibyan	Committee Member	Present	Asked whether a directly elected mayor could appoint commissioners, raised the question of post-ballot outreach sequencing, proposed investigating cities already operating under the charter models under consideration, and inquired about mayoral vacancy succession. Also raised council salary as a future topic.
Lilit Harutyunyan	Committee Member	Present	Present and confirmed in roll call. Limited transcribed substantive contribution captured in audio record.
Linda Megerdichian	Committee Member	Present	Raised the proposal for public surveys to gather civic input prior to recommendations. Noted the practical limitations of web-form comment submissions. Asked about the legality of holdover board and commission appointments. Observed that if 6 districts are adopted with an elected mayor, the mayor would need a vote to prevent ties.
Paul Karapetian	Committee Member	Present	Present and confirmed in roll call. Limited transcribed substantive contribution captured in audio record during this session.
Rachel Yoo	Committee Member	Present	Active contributor. Raised the structural arithmetic of even versus odd district numbers relative to mayoral voting. Asked about term limits, the permissibility of a termed-out mayor running for council, campaign contribution dynamics, and city authority to conduct post-ballot outreach.
Stephen Meek	Committee Member	Present	Regular participating committee member. Active in facilitating discussion flow and asking clarifying questions of staff on Brown Act implications, mayoral voice versus vote distinctions, emergency powers, agenda-setting authority, and ballot deadlines. Also seconded the call for a structured voting framework at the next meeting.

Participant Name	Role / Title	Status	Notes / Contributions
Bryan Smith	Committee Member	Present	Stated a preference for retaining the rotating mayoralty at the outset. Subsequently expressed openness to six districts with a directly elected mayor. Seconded the minutes approval motion. Raised the question of whether the committee could make a recommendation on districts independently of completing the full charter review, given the ballot deadline.
John Takhtalian	Assistant City Manager	Present	Provided staff expertise on mayoral models, board and commission appointment dynamics, emergency management structure, agenda-setting practices, and the legal prohibition on city advocacy once a charter amendment reaches the ballot. Confirmed the city's website modification enabling pre-meeting public comment submission.
Lucy Varpetian	Principal Assistant City Attorney	Present	Provided legal guidance on term limits jurisprudence, mayoral vacancy succession, Brown Act constraints on charter amendments, the June 2026 ballot deadline and 90-day call-for-elections requirement, campaign contributions under municipal code and state law, and the process for continued agenda items once publicly noticed.
Aaron Israel	Principal Assistant City Attorney	Present	Addressed Allan Durham's question on Brown Act constraints on mayoral agenda-setting authority and confirmed that charter language cannot override the Brown Act. Present throughout for legal consultation.
Herbert Molano	Public Speaker	Present	Transparent Cities LLC / Transparent Glendale. Spoke twice: during Oral Communications with a printed handout documenting park deficits and road neglect in South Glendale, and during Future Agendas proposing a comparative study of cities already operating under the charter models under consideration. 24-year Glendale civic activist.
Chris Welch	Public Speaker	Present	26-year Glendale resident, Adams Hill neighborhood (South Glendale). Advocated for six-district elections and an at-large elected mayor. Referenced the Dave's Redistricting app to illustrate how six districts would allocate three seats to South Glendale. Spoke during Oral Communications.

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
08:34	Item 1: Roll Call	Coordinator Greg Kajszo opened the March 6, 2025 meeting of the Glendale Charter Review Committee. Chair Steven Flower called the meeting to order. Roll call was conducted. All twelve committee members were present: Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutyunyan, Karapetian, Manasserian, Megerdichian, Meek, Miller, Povilaitis, Smith, and Yoo. No absences were recorded.

Timestamp	Agenda Item / Event	Summary of Deliberation
08:58	Item 2: Regular Business Agenda — Report of the City Clerk	The Coordinator reported that the agenda for the March 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Committee was posted on March 3, 2025 on the bulletin board outside City Hall.
08:58	Item 3: Oral Communications	The Coordinator announced one in-person request to speak and no callers. Two speakers ultimately addressed the committee. Herbert Molano was recognized first. He distributed a printed handout to committee members before speaking. Molano opened by providing rationale for why structural governance reform — specifically districting — was necessary in Glendale, grounding his argument in two documented and ongoing failures: park deficits in South Glendale and road deterioration across the city. He cited a recreational element document prepared approximately 30 years ago as part of Glendale's General Plan, which explicitly identified areas of the city with 27,000 residents served by zero neighborhood parks, and noted that nothing substantive had been done in the intervening 30 years despite the city paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for the study. He referenced a subsequent Blue Ribbon ...
16:05	Item 4: Approval of Minutes	Chair Flower asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the prior meeting. Carl Povilaitis moved. Bryan Smith seconded. A voice vote was called. The minutes were approved. No abstentions or noes were noted in the transcript.
16:43	Item 5: Staff Comments	John Takhtalian reported that the committee's dedicated city webpage had been modified to enable submission of public comments and questions to staff, which would then be transmitted to committee members prior to meetings. This action fulfilled a request made at the conclusion of the prior meeting. Committee Member Miller asked whether public comments submitted in advance could be distributed to committee members, and whether documents prepared for the committee — including the council deliberation summary — could be made publicly accessible via the committee webpage. Chair Flower extended Miller's point, suggesting a blanket rule that all materials provided to the committee be made available in a single accessible location given their public-record status. Takhtalian confirmed both proposals were technically feasible and indicated the webpage could be updated within a week if directed ...
21:37	Item 6A: Composition of the City Council (At-Large vs. District Elections; Number of Council Seats; Appointed vs. Directly Elected Mayor)	Chair Flower opened the item as a continuation of the prior meeting's discussion. He proposed, with committee assent, to focus the evening's deliberation on the directly elected mayor question rather than re-entering the broader district debate, while acknowledging the two topics are intertwined. All committee members present indicated comfort with this approach. Before the substantive discussion began, a second public speaker — Herbert Molano — was recognized during the oral communications period that had remained open. Molano addressed the committee on the question of mayoral qualifications and judgment. He referenced prior Glendale mayors including Gus Gomez and Artie Kotzakian, both residents of South Glendale, noting that geographic representation alone had not translated into effective advocacy for the community's documented infrastructure needs. He warned that mayors and council ...
02:13:14	Item 7: Reports — Information Only	Staff reported no informational items at this time.

Timestamp	Agenda Item / Event	Summary of Deliberation
02:13:34	Item 8: Future Agendas	The following items were confirmed for the next meeting agenda: (1) structured voting framework on council composition (districts, number of seats, directly elected mayor) prepared by staff; (2) term length and term limits for a directly elected mayor; (3) the revolving-door question of whether a termed-out mayor may immediately seek a council seat; (4) council compensation/salary (noted as a charter item requiring charter amendment for any change). Campaign contribution limits were noted as a candidate for the non-charter running list. Chair Flower's precinct-level data analysis was deferred to the next meeting. Herbert Molano was recognized briefly during this item and proposed that the committee examine cities already operating under the charter models under consideration as real-world governance evidence, citing Los Angeles's performance during the January 2025 fire emergency as an i...
02:18:44	Item 9: Adjournment	Carl Povilaitis moved adjournment. Denise Miller seconded. Voice vote: all ayes. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:19 PM.

5. Reconstructed Meeting Minutes

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

Roll Call

Meeting called to order by Chair Steven Flower at 5:00 PM. All twelve committee members present: Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutyunyan, Karapetian, Manasserian, Megerdichian, Meek, Miller, Povilaitis, Smith, Yoo. No absences.

Regular Business Agenda — Posting of Agenda

Coordinator Greg Kajszo reported the agenda for the March 6, 2025 Regular Meeting was posted on March 3, 2025 on the bulletin board outside City Hall.

Oral Communications

Two public speakers addressed the committee. Herbert Molano (Transparent Glendale), speaking with a printed handout, documented a 30-year park deficit affecting approximately 27,000 South Glendale residents, decades of unrepaired road infrastructure, and the structural governance failures underlying both, providing this as rationale for the committee's charter reform work. He offered to supply corroborating documentation and provided his contact email. Chris Welch, a 26-year Adams Hill resident, advocated for six-district elections and an at-large elected mayor, citing the Dave's Redistricting app's modeling showing three of six districts falling south of the 134 freeway and the chronic underrepresentation of South Glendale on the council. Herbert Molano also spoke a second time during the oral communications period, warning against the concentration of mayoral power and recommending retention of the rotating mayoralty as a structural safeguard.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the prior meeting approved. Motion: Carl Povilaitis. Second: Bryan Smith. Voice vote: all ayes. No noes or abstentions recorded. Passed.

Staff Comments

John Takhtalian reported the committee's city webpage had been modified to enable pre-meeting public comment submission. Committee Member Miller requested that pre-submitted comments and prior council deliberation materials be made available to members and publicly accessible on the webpage. Chair Flower requested a blanket rule that all committee materials be posted given their public-record status. Takhtalian confirmed feasibility and committed to a one-week turnaround. Committee Member Megerdichian requested exploration of a public survey mechanism using existing city email subscriber lists. Takhtalian committed to taking the request to the city manager's office.

Item 6A: Composition of the City Council

Continued discussion on at-large versus district elections, number of council seats, and appointed versus directly elected mayor. Staff recapped four California directly elected mayor models. The committee reached informal consensus on the following mayoral parameters: presiding officer role; equal voice and equal vote; no veto power; no unilateral appointment authority; no insertion into emergency chain of command; no independent policy interpretation authority. The committee did not reach a formal vote on any substantive question. Committee Member Miller offered a detailed process recommendation including a timeline, ballot strategy, and outreach methodology proposal. Chair Flower supported Miller's public-awareness framing. The committee agreed to return at the next meeting with a staff-prepared structured voting framework to reach documented consensus on council composition, term length and term limits, the revolving-door question, and related items. June 2026 ballot deadline (requiring approximately 90-day lead time) confirmed by Lucy Varpetian.

Future Agendas

Next meeting agenda items confirmed: structured consensus voting framework on council composition; term length and term limits for directly elected mayor; revolving-door rule for termed-out mayor seeking council seat; council compensation. Campaign contribution limits added to non-charter running list. Herbert Molano proposed adding a comparative analysis of cities operating under the charter models under consideration. Chair Flower's precinct data analysis deferred to next meeting.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Carl Povilaitis. Second: Denise Miller. Voice vote: all ayes. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:19 PM.

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	Approve the minutes of the prior meeting	Carl Povilaitis	Bryan Smith	PASSED	Voice vote — all ayes. No noes or abstentions recorded in transcript. Individual member-by-member roll call was not conducted for this item.
Item 9: Adjournment	Adjourn the meeting	Carl Povilaitis	Denise Miller	PASSED	Voice vote — all ayes.

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. Directed the discussion toward the mayoral question to structure the evening's deliberation productively while leaving the district question open for a future meeting.
District Data Analysis	Reported having personally analyzed precinct-level voting data across four elections, distinguishing it from the demographic data in the sample maps. Offered to share his analysis via staff for the next meeting.
Public Awareness Observation	At 01:58:28, articulated that public awareness of the district and charter reform question has been markedly lower than awareness of minor municipal matters such as trash can modifications. Described the charter reform effort as equivalent in consequence to open-heart surgery.

Steven Flower (Chair)	Contribution Summary
Campaign Contributions	Raised the question of whether campaign contribution limits should be considered in context of district elections, noting that changing the structure of elections substantively affects the contribution landscape. Accepted staff's suggestion to place the item on the non-charter running list.
Policy Interpretation Authority	Cautioned that vesting a directly elected mayor with policy interpretation authority is dangerous when concentrated in one person. Used the phrase 'mayor's gonna mayor' to describe the practical reality that strong personalities will exercise informal authority regardless of formal charter constraints.
Carl Povilaitis (Vice Chair)	Contribution Summary
Mayoral Veto	Stated clearly that Glendale's scale of 200,000 residents does not warrant the power concentration veto authority entails. Argued that effective governance at this scale requires consensus-building, not a single officer's override capacity.
Revolving Door / Combined Term Limits	Raised the question of whether a combined limit on total time in elected city office — across mayor and council member roles — would be appropriate, framing it as a hypothetical with significant structural implications.
Civil Service and Finance	Noted at 01:53:52 that civil service provisions and financial charter language are additional review topics beyond the council composition question, ensuring the committee's scope is understood to extend beyond the current agenda item.
Council Mandate	Observed that the City Council chose to place these questions before the committee despite having done extensive prior work, suggesting the council genuinely wants independent feedback — which could include a recommendation against districting.
Denise Miller (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Process Critique and Outreach Proposal	Delivered the meeting's most detailed substantive intervention beginning at 01:36:25. Argued that the prior public engagement effort — yielding approximately 262 map participants — was structurally inadequate. Proposed that the committee recommend to the City Council: a June 2026 ballot placement; a consultant directed with explicit outreach methodology parameters; public presentation of maps rather than open-ended public map generation; and outreach materials including both the case for and the case against districting. Self-identified as a project manager and noted she had mapped the timeline through 2030.
Mayoral Appointment Power	At 01:12:27, highlighted the irony of vesting appointment authority in a single elected mayor after the City Council had spent 12 to 18 months developing a dual-panel appointment system specifically to prevent single-member dominance.
Policy Interpretation Authority	At 57:04, stated she would not support charter language granting the mayor independent policy interpretation authority after hearing staff's explanation, finding it creates unacceptable proximity to unilateral staff direction.
Preference for Voting	At 01:58:27, expressed a preference for the committee to begin voting on substantive questions rather than continuing open-ended deliberation. Supported the staff proposal for a structured voting checklist at the next meeting.
Allan Durham (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Board and Commission Appointment Mechanics	Clarified for Committee Member Yoo at 01:09:26 that current board and commission listings are in transition and should not be read as reflecting the new dual-panel appointment system, which has not yet been fully implemented.
Ballot Map Requirement	At 02:04:50, noted that the City Council has explicitly stated that any future ballot measure on districting must include a specific map, drawing on the lesson of the prior failed ballot measure which lacked one.

Allan Durham (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Mayoral Vote	Argued against disenfranchising an elected mayor from voting, noting that an at-large mayor should serve as a resource that any constituent — regardless of district — can approach, and that this representational value requires an equal vote.
Agenda-Setting Authority	At 01:01:03, asked Aaron Israel whether mayoral policy directive authority would allow the mayor to place items on the agenda without prior council agreement, establishing the Brown Act as the binding constraint.
Elizabeth Manasserian (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Voting Data and Representation	At 02:09:16, argued that if the central claim for districting is underrepresentation of South Glendale, the relevant evidence is not just who lives south of the 134 but how South Glendale voters actually vote when given a choice between candidates from their area versus other areas — data she noted was not available in the sample maps.
Mayoral Budget Authority	Asked at 40:53 whether a directly elected mayor in a council-manager form of government could be vested with budget-setting authority. Staff confirmed this is not typical in council-manager governments.
City Council Encouragement of Public Attendance	Reported that the City Attorney had reiterated at a recent City Council meeting an encouragement for the public to attend Charter Review Committee sessions, and that the city's Instagram account had publicized the committee.
Rachel Yoo (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Arithmetic of Districts and Mayoral Voting	At 50:08, raised the structural arithmetic concern: with six districts and a voting mayor, the total council body numbers seven — an odd number that eliminates the risk of structural tie votes. This observation was accepted by the committee and implicitly shaped the informal consensus toward an equal-vote mayor paired with an even number of districts.
Revolving Door Rule	At 01:22:00, raised the question of whether a mayor who has served their maximum terms should be permitted to immediately run for a council seat, noting the potential for indefinite total tenure in elected city government through rotation between offices.
City Advocacy Limits Post-Ballot	At 01:47:47, asked Takhtalian directly whether the city can conduct outreach and promotion of a ballot measure after it has been placed on the ballot. Takhtalian confirmed that advocacy is prohibited; only neutral informational outreach is permissible using city resources.
Ani Garibyan (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Commissioner Appointments by Mayor	At 39:29, asked whether a directly elected mayor could appoint commissioners. Staff confirmed this is a possible but not universal power in council-manager cities with directly elected mayors, subject to council confirmation.
Post-Ballot Outreach Sequencing	At 02:01:42, asked whether, if the ballot measure passes on the question of whether to have districts and a mayor, the detailed implementation work — outreach, mapping — could be assigned to a city department after the vote rather than before. Durham clarified that the council has indicated a specific map must accompany the ballot measure.
Mayoral Vacancy Succession	At 02:02:40, asked what happens if a directly elected mayor resigns or is removed mid-term. Lucy Varpetian explained that depending on time remaining, the vacancy would be filled by appointment or a special election, noting the significant cost of special elections as a factor.
Comparative City Research Proposal	Proposed that the committee examine the governance outcomes of cities already operating under the charter models under consideration — a suggestion that overlapped with and reinforced Herbert Molano's later proposal during Future Agendas.

Linda Megerdichian (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Public Survey Proposal	Proposed at 20:43 and again at 01:44:42 that the committee use city email subscriber lists to distribute a structured public survey. Argued that a brief clickable survey is more likely to generate responses than a web-form comment box, and that structured data would help the committee understand where the public actually stands on key questions.
Holdover Appointments	At 01:15:10, raised the legality of board and commission members serving beyond their terms pending new appointments, and questioned why a new appointment process was not accelerating replacement of holdovers.
Strong Mayor and Decision Quality	Observed that if a strong mayor system were adopted, the nature of mayoral authority would itself define the structural situation — underscoring the interdependence of the mayoral and district questions.
Bryan Smith (Committee Member)	Contribution Summary
Rotating Mayoralty Preference	At 24:05, stated a clear preference for retaining the rotating mayoralty. Subsequently engaged constructively with the hypothetical directly elected mayor framework without abandoning his stated baseline preference.
Ballot Deadline and Sequential Recommendations	At 01:54:19, raised the question of whether the committee could make a recommendation on districts independently of completing the full charter review, in order to meet the June 2026 ballot deadline. Staff confirmed this was within the committee's contemplated scope.
City Manager as Policy Interpreter	At 59:52, offered the practical observation that in a council-manager form of government, the city manager — not the mayor — is the appropriate entity to seek clarification from the council on the meaning of an adopted policy, functioning as a check on ambiguity without concentrating interpretive power in one elected officer.
John Takhtalian (Assistant City Manager)	Contribution Summary
Mayoral Model Presentation	Recapped the four directly elected mayor models from the January staff presentation. Described the distinction between common and occasional mayoral duties across California council-manager cities.
Appointment Process Context	At 01:06:12, described the City Council's 12-to-18-month development of the new dual-panel appointment process, including the transition structure in which all board and commission seats are being reappointed fresh on two-and-four-year terms.
Post-Ballot Advocacy Prohibition	At 01:47:09, confirmed that once a charter amendment is placed on the ballot, the city may provide neutral informational sessions but is legally prohibited from engaging in advocacy. Hiring consultants to promote a ballot position is prohibited.
Emergency Powers Complexity	At 48:23, noted that inserting a directly elected mayor into the city's emergency management chain of command would involve not just structural complexity but state and national certification requirements for the emergency manager role.
Agenda-Setting Practice	At 01:30:51, described the current practice: the city manager provides the mayor with a weekly agenda item list, they meet regularly to determine timing, and removal of an agenda item once publicly noticed requires council majority agreement.
Lucy Varpetian (Principal Assistant City Attorney)	Contribution Summary
June 2026 Ballot Deadline	At 01:55:47, confirmed that placing a charter amendment on the June 2026 ballot requires a call for elections at least 90 days in advance, effectively requiring finalized recommendations to council well before that date. Proposed a staff-prepared structured voting checklist for the next meeting to advance the committee's deliberative progress.

Lucy Varpetian (Principal Assistant City Attorney)	Contribution Summary
Term Limits Jurisprudence	At 01:23:45, confirmed that case law regulates term limits and permanent preclusion from office-seeking, and committed to bringing back a legal analysis to inform the committee's recommendation.
Mayoral Vacancy Succession	Explained the default vacancy-filling mechanism: appointment if substantial time remains, special election otherwise — noting the significant cost of special elections as a relevant design consideration.
Non-Charter Items Running List	At 02:18:04, confirmed the existence of a running list for items the committee wishes to present to the council that fall outside charter scope, including campaign contribution limits.
Board Appointment Alignment	At 01:09:08, clarified that the reason board member terms are aligned with specific council positions is to ensure that board terms begin and end in coordination with council position cycles.
Aaron Israel (Principal Assistant City Attorney)	Contribution Summary
Brown Act Constraint on Agenda-Setting	At 01:01:26, confirmed that the Brown Act requires all council actions — including placing items on the agenda — to occur in a publicly noticed meeting, and that the charter cannot override the Brown Act. Addressed Allan Durham's question on whether a directly elected mayor's policy directive authority would allow unilateral agenda manipulation.
Herbert Molano (Public Speaker — Transparent Glendale)	Contribution Summary
First Oral Communications Intervention (09:41)	Distributed a printed handout to committee members. Presented a documented record of 30-year park deficit in South Glendale: a city-commissioned recreational element of the General Plan identified areas with 27,000 residents served by zero neighborhood parks. A subsequent Blue Ribbon Committee reached the same conclusion. Neither produced remedial council action. Contrasted this with the city's approximate \$25 billion in aggregate revenues over the same period. Also documented roads on Lexington Drive between Brent Boulevard and Glendale Avenue unrepaired for approximately 40 years, and residential streets unrepaired for 50 or more years. Noted that some council-directed ordinances based on false and misleading information had cost the public hundreds of millions of dollars. Offered corroborating documentation and provided his email: herbertmolano@gmail.com. Closed by comparing Glendale's civic participation rate unfavorably with Carlsbad, where approximately 50 percent of the public votes on city elections.
Second Oral Communications Intervention — Mayoral Power Warning (29:18)	Referenced prior South Glendale mayors Gus Gomez and Artie Kotzakian to demonstrate that geographic representation alone does not translate into effective community advocacy. Warned that mayors and council members must make decisions across domains — policing, urban design, utility rates, homelessness policy, land use — for which most candidates are substantively unprepared. Argued that a dedicated elected mayor with veto power would concentrate this risk for 4 years. Recommended retention of the rotating mayoralty as a structural safeguard against single-issue ideology or well-intentioned ignorance driving sustained policy damage.
Future Agendas Intervention (02:13:45)	Proposed that the committee examine cities already operating under the charter models under consideration to gather real-world governance performance evidence before recommending similar structures for Glendale. Cited the City of Los Angeles — which has districts and a directly elected strong mayor — and its performance during the January 2025 fire emergency as an instructive example of the risks of a district-and-strong-mayor structure. Recommended this comparative analysis as a formal future agenda item.

Chris Welch (Public Speaker)	Contribution Summary
Oral Communications Intervention (26:31)	26-year Glendale resident from Adams Hill (South Glendale). Advocated for six-district elections and an at-large elected mayor. Described using the Dave's Redistricting app to model six districts for Glendale, working inward from the corners of the city. Concluded that three of the six districts would fall south of the 134 freeway. Noted that South Glendale has historically been represented by no more than one councilmember at a time. Argued that district representation ensures neighborhoods affected by development decisions have effective council advocates who live in and are answerable to those communities. Expressed support for development where transit and urban infrastructure support it and frustration that development burden falls disproportionately on South Glendale while other neighborhoods successfully resist it.

8. Governance & Audit Observations

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

- **Institutional Doublespeak (Lutz):** John Takhtalian's description of the post-ballot advocacy prohibition — 'the advocacy piece has to end' and 'there's a level to the information' — accurately describes a legal constraint but functions simultaneously as a frame that limits how the committee discusses its own outreach recommendations. The language 'informational sessions' versus 'advocacy' creates a category distinction that, while legally grounded, forecloses discussion of substantive public education. This is consistent with the Lutz taxonomy of institutional language that diffuses rather than assigns responsibility for outcomes. (Timestamp: 01:47:09)
- **Anecdote Overweighting / Base-Rate Neglect (Tetlock/Galef):** Carl Povilaitis cited the Los Angeles fire emergency response as evidence of the risks of a district-and-strong-mayor governance structure at 01:53:19. This is a vivid, high-salience single case. The Tetlock calibrated standard ('consistent with' rather than definitive) requires noting that this single event, while instructive, does not constitute base-rate evidence about the governance performance of district-and-mayor cities generally. Herbert Molano made the same inferential move during Future Agendas. Both interventions are valuable as risk-framing but would benefit from systematic comparative analysis — which Molano himself proposed as a future agenda item.
- **Public Input Erasure Pattern:** Denise Miller disclosed at 01:38:00 that the prior public engagement process produced approximately 262 participants in mapping exercises — a figure she characterized as inadequate for the magnitude of a charter amendment. This figure was stated plainly in the meeting but does not appear in the official minutes, which record only that 'Two speakers were heard' under Oral Communications and make no reference to the adequacy or inadequacy of prior public engagement. The committee's discussion of this inadequacy is a substantive governance finding with direct implications for the legitimacy of the ballot process.
- **Face-Saving / Hedged Challenge (Brown and Levinson):** Stephen Meek's repeated framing of structural questions as 'hypothetical' — 'for purpose of this discussion, we can frame it as if there were to be a separately elected mayor' (26:02) — is consistent with the Brown and Levinson mechanism of softening a face-threatening act (forcing committee members to commit to a position) by maintaining the frame of non-binding exploration. This allowed productive deliberation across members with materially different starting positions on districting and the mayor. It also, however, meant that no formal position was recorded at the meeting's close, leaving the committee's output for this session entirely in the category of informal consensus.
- **Extractive Institutions / Capital Deferral (Acemoglu and Robinson):** Herbert Molano's Oral Communications presentation documented what is consistent with the Acemoglu and Robinson pattern of extractive institutional behavior: approximately \$25 billion in aggregate city revenues over 30 years, during which documented park deficits and road deterioration in South Glendale went unaddressed despite two separate formal studies recommending remediation. The presentation is grounded in a city-commissioned General Plan element and a Blue Ribbon Committee report — public documents. These are structural facts, not characterizations of intent, and they directly implicate the adequacy of the council's resource allocation decisions over multiple decades. (Timestamp: 10:56)
- **Collective Action / Diffuse Public, Concentrated Benefit (Olson):** The committee's discussion of public awareness and engagement — Chair Flower's observation that the public was more aware of trash can changes than of charter reform, and

Denise Miller's critique that prior outreach produced only 262 participants — is structurally consistent with Olson's collective action problem: the costs of civic participation are diffuse and individually high, while the benefits of tracking a charter reform effort are individually small and uncertain. This dynamic is not a failing of individuals but a predictable structural feature of large-electorate governance without targeted, accessible outreach.

- **Agenda-Setting Authority / Chair Authority (Brown and Levinson):** At 02:13:14, Chair Flower declined to recognize a public speaker who had requested to speak during the business item discussion, citing the lateness of the hour and the fact that the item had moved to Future Agendas. The speaker was directed to attend the next meeting. This is consistent with chair authority over meeting management, but the effect is that a member of the public who had remained present throughout an approximately two-hour session was not heard on the substantive item that triggered their attendance. No committee member raised an objection.
- **Falsifiability / Evidence-of-Absence Conflation (Popper/Galef):** Elizabeth Manasserian's request at 02:09:16 for precinct-level election result data — specifically, how South Glendale voters have voted when given a choice between candidates from their area versus other areas — reflects a genuine evidentiary gap in the committee's deliberative record. Chair Flower confirmed the precinct data and the demographic sample maps are 'apples and oranges' and that election result data by district has not been provided. The absence of this data should not be read as absence of the underlying pattern; it is a data gap requiring resolution before the representation claim can be empirically evaluated.
- **Commitment and Consistency (Cialdini):** The staff's framing throughout the meeting — presenting the four directly elected mayor models and their common and occasional duties — functions as an anchoring framework that implicitly narrows the committee's option space to variations within the council-manager model. The committee's informal consensus positions (equal vote, no veto, no appointment power) are all consistent with the most common model (Model 1). Whether this reflects independent committee deliberation arriving at the dominant model or anchoring to the presented option is not determinable from the transcript alone, but the dynamic is consistent with Cialdini's commitment-and-consistency mechanism operating through agenda structure.
- **Doublespeak / Passive Voice (Lutz):** At 01:31:30, Takhtalian described the question of whether a mayor could remove an agendized item by saying 'I'm kind of tiptoeing into uncomfortable territory.' This framing both signals awareness of a sensitive institutional dynamic and deflects direct engagement with it. The phrase is consistent with the Lutz category of language that diffuses institutional discomfort without resolving it. Lucy Varpetian's subsequent clarification was more specific and procedurally grounded.
- **Voluntary Disclosure:** Denise Miller disclosed mid-discussion that she had personally reviewed all prior City Council deliberation videos on the district question, allowing the committee to understand the basis for her specific claims about council positions on the number of districts and the nature of prior public engagement. This voluntary transparency is a positive governance norm. It is noted here because it stands in favorable contrast to undisclosed affiliations, which this governance framework is also designed to detect.

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
Public Input Adequacy Tracking	Across all Charter Review Committee meetings, how many times did staff or committee members disclose the number of participants in prior public engagement efforts, and what were the figures? Does the committee's deliberative record reflect engagement adequacy as a recurring concern?
Informal Consensus to Formal Vote Conversion	For each informal consensus position reached at the March 6, 2025 meeting — no veto, equal vote, no mayoral appointment power — was a corresponding formal vote eventually taken, and did the formal vote outcome match the informal consensus?

Analytical Focus	Example Query Grounded in This Meeting
Herbert Molano Substantive Omission Audit	Across all meetings at which Herbert Molano presented substantive data — park deficits, road deterioration, false-and-misleading ordinances, comparative city governance — what proportion of his specific factual claims appear in the official minutes versus only in the verified transcript?
Ballot Deadline Pressure Analysis	Given the confirmed June 2026 ballot deadline and the 90-day call-for-elections lead time, at what meetings did the committee discuss deadline pressure, and did deadline urgency appear to compress deliberation depth on specific charter questions?
Mayoral Model Position Consistency	Did individual committee members who expressed a position on veto power, appointment authority, or term limits at the March 6, 2025 meeting subsequently vote consistently with those stated positions when formal votes were taken?
Staff Disclosure Tracking — Post-Ballot Advocacy Constraint	John Takhtalian disclosed at this meeting that city advocacy on a ballot measure is legally prohibited once it reaches the ballot. Did this disclosure appear in official minutes, and did it subsequently shape committee recommendations on outreach strategy?
South Glendale Representation Evidence Gap	Elizabeth Manasserian identified at this meeting that precinct-level election result data — how South Glendale voters vote when given South Glendale candidates — had not been provided to the committee. Was this data subsequently supplied, and did it inform later committee deliberation on the representation rationale for districting?
Comparative City Proposal Tracking	Herbert Molano proposed at this meeting that the committee examine governance outcomes in cities already operating under the charter models under consideration, citing Los Angeles. Was this proposal ever agendized, and if so, what evidence was presented?
Rotating Versus Elected Mayor Coalition Mapping	Bryan Smith stated a clear preference for the rotating mayoralty at this meeting. Did his position evolve across subsequent meetings, and how did the committee's informal consensus position on a directly elected mayor form relative to members' stated starting positions?
Outreach Methodology Recommendation Tracking	Denise Miller proposed specific outreach methodology parameters at this meeting, including consultant-directed map presentation and dual-sided outreach materials. Did the committee's final recommendation to the City Council incorporate any of these specific elements?

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

March 6, 2025, at 5:00 PM

1. ROLL CALL

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

Present: Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutunian, 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 March 6, 2025

Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Committee was Posted on March 3, 2025, on the Bulletin Board Outside City Hall.

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- One speaker and was heard

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Motion to approve: Vice Chair Povilaitis
- Second: Committee Member Meek

Ayes: Durham, Flower, Garibyan, Harutunian, Karapetian, Manasserian, Megerdichian, Meek, Miller, Povilaitis, Smith, Yoo

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

5. STAFF COMMENTS

6. BUSINESS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Composition of the City Council (At-Large District Elections, Number of

City Council Seats, Appointed Versus Directly-Elected Mayor)

- Two speakers were heard

7. REPORTS - INFORMATION ONLY

8. FUTURE AGENDAS

- Composition of City Council

9. ADJOURNMENT @ 7:19 PM

- Motion: Vice Chair Povilaitis
- Second: Committee Member Miller

11. Discrepancy Analysis — Official Minutes vs. Transcript

The official minutes for the March 6, 2025 meeting record only that 'One speaker was heard' under Item 3: Oral Communications. The verified transcript documents three public interventions by two named speakers: Herbert Molano spoke twice during the oral communications period and once during the Future Agendas item; Chris Welch spoke once during oral communications. The official minutes record no speaker names, no substantive content from any public intervention, no reference to the printed handout distributed by Herbert Molano, and no summary of the substantive data he presented — including the 30-year park deficit affecting approximately 27,000 South Glendale residents, the documented road deterioration, the \$25 billion aggregate city revenue figure, or the structural governance critique. The minutes similarly record no content from Chris Welch's advocacy for six-district elections or his Dave's Redistricting analysis. Under Item 6A, the official minutes record only 'Two speakers were heard' with no further detail on content. The substantive staff discussion on mayoral models, the committee's informal consensus positions, Denise Miller's extended outreach critique and project-management proposal, the disclosure by John Takhtalian of the post-ballot advocacy prohibition, and Chair Flower's public awareness observation are entirely absent from the official minutes. The official minutes' record of the minutes approval vote lists all twelve members as voting Aye with no noes and no abstentions, which is consistent with the transcript's voice vote record. The minutes correctly record the adjournment motion (Povilaitis) and second (Miller).

Item	Official Minutes Record	Transcript Record	Assessment / Severity
Item 3: Oral Communications — Speaker Count	'One speaker was heard'	Three public interventions by two named speakers: Herbert Molano (twice during oral communications, once during Future Agendas) and Chris Welch (once during oral communications).	The official minutes undercount public speakers by at least one and omit the Future Agendas intervention entirely. The single-sentence summary provides no substantive content from either speaker.
Item 3: Oral Communications — Herbert Molano Content	No mention of speaker name, no mention of printed handout, no mention of substantive content.	Molano distributed a printed handout; documented 30-year park deficit affecting 27,000 South Glendale residents; cited city-commissioned General Plan recreational element and Blue Ribbon Committee report; documented road deterioration of 40-50+ years on multiple streets; cited approximately \$25 billion in aggregate city revenues over the same period; described ordinances based on false and misleading information costing hundreds of millions; compared Glendale's civic participation rate unfavorably with Carlsbad; provided contact email and offered corroborating documentation to committee members.	Complete erasure of a substantive, data-grounded public presentation supported by formal city documents. The handout distributed to committee members is not referenced.
Item 3: Oral Communications — Chris Welch Content	No mention of speaker name, no mention of substantive content.	26-year Adams Hill resident advocated for six-district elections and an at-large elected mayor; described Dave's Redistricting app modeling showing three of six districts falling south of the 134 freeway; documented historic underrepresentation of South Glendale on the council; argued that development burden falls disproportionately on South Glendale.	Complete erasure of a named public speaker's advocacy and data-supported arguments on the central agenda item.
Item 6A: Business Discussion — Substantive Deliberation	Not reflected in the March 6 minutes document provided. The document provided contains only the March 6 meeting structure through adjournment with no narrative on Item 6A deliberation.	Extended discussion covering: four directly elected mayor models; informal consensus on no veto, equal vote, no appointment power, no emergency chain insertion, no policy interpretation authority; Denise Miller's outreach critique (262 prior participants); John Takhtalian's disclosure of post-ballot advocacy prohibition; Chair Flower's public awareness observation (open-heart surgery characterization); Rachel Yoo's arithmetic point on even districts and mayoral voting; Elizabeth Manasserian's voting data gap observation; Denise Miller's project-managed timeline proposal; agreement to return with structured voting checklist; June 2026 deadline confirmation; revolving-door question raised and deferred.	The entire substantive deliberation of the meeting's principal agenda item is absent from the official minutes as provided, including significant staff disclosures, committee member positions, and governance-relevant findings.

Item	Official Minutes Record	Transcript Record	Assessment / Severity
Item 8: Future Agendas — Herbert Molano Intervention	No reference to public speaker intervention during Future Agendas.	Herbert Molano was recognized during Future Agendas and proposed that the committee conduct a comparative analysis of cities already operating under the charter models under consideration, specifically citing Los Angeles's performance during the January 2025 fire emergency.	A substantive public policy proposal with direct relevance to the committee's future deliberative agenda is entirely absent from the official record.

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 Oral Communications Intervention: Park Deficit and Road Deterioration (10:56)

[10:56] Herbert Molano: In this document written 30 years ago, it states very clearly that we have areas in Glendale with 27,000 people with zero, zero neighborhood parks, and nothing has been done about it in 30 years.

[11:14] Herbert Molano: And yet this document the city paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for to do, basically they noted and filed and pretty much ignored it, ignored the needs of South Glendale.

[11:37] Herbert Molano: If you were to add all of the monies collected by the city during those 30 years, it could be around \$25 billion. They could not spend \$10 million to put a park.

[12:03] Herbert Molano: If you were to drive between Brent Boulevard and Glendale Avenue on Lexington, you'll see roads that haven't been fixed in 40 years. There are neighborhoods that are single-family homes. Those roads have not been fixed in 50 years or more.

[14:34] Herbert Molano: This is a city that does not have that much public participation. And if you were to compare this city to Carlsbad, where everything that I said they do — the parkland and the roadways and the great urban design — it occurs there because there is public participation at the 50th percent level for a city council session. And here we don't have that.

Herbert Molano — Second Oral Communications Intervention: Warning on Mayoral Power Concentration (29:18)

[29:18] Herbert Molano: Members of the Charter Review Committee, I want to address the following: my concerns concerning who gets elected.

[30:15] Herbert Molano: The decisions that a mayor will make oftentimes extend far and beyond their usual advocacy. They usually — people run for office for one particular hot topic. Their ideology that they want to move forward, maybe sometimes land use issues. But they have to make decisions on a whole range of things — on policing, on urban design, on Glendale Water and Power, on the rates that we pay, on what to do about the homeless — a whole range of things that most individuals are really not prepared to do.

[31:18] Herbert Molano: I think that by moving the mayor year after year, at least it will assure us that not one person is going to have so much power that their ignorance eventually we wind up paying for, right? Or their single-issue advocacy continues to be the mainstay and everything else is forgotten.

Chris Welch — Oral Communications: Case for Six Districts (26:31)

[27:07] Chris Welch: Basically how it shakes out is that the south part of Glendale would have 3 districts. Basically all of the areas south of the 134 would have 3 districts. It's been a very long time that I can recall that we've had more than maybe one councilperson who has lived south of the 134.

[28:02] Chris Welch: I think that having somebody who represents a particular area of the city will be the best advocate for that area of the city.

[29:02] Chris Welch: I'm here to speak on behalf of and in support of district-based elections, as well as an at-large elected mayor as well.

Staff Presentation — Four Directly Elected Mayor Models (32:32)

[33:34] John Takhtalian: There are 4 models. They share 3 common features. The mayor is, in each of them, elected at large, serves as presiding officer of the council, and has an equal voice on all matters before the council.

[34:00] John Takhtalian: The most common model for a directly elected mayor is one in which the mayor has an equal voice and vote on all matters before the council, but not veto power.

[34:47] John Takhtalian: The second model, which for the sake of convenience we'll call the Long Beach model, this model has a directly elected mayor with no vote on matters before the council. However, the mayor does have veto power. However, the council can override a mayoral veto by a 2/3 supermajority vote.

Informal Consensus — No Veto Power (52:37)

[52:37] Carl Povilaitis: No.

[52:40] Linda Megerdichian: No.

[52:41] Allan Durham: I think it gives the mayor too much power over policy.

[52:46] Stephen Meek: Yeah, I tend to agree. I think the purpose is to kind of counterbalance but not to dominate.

[52:54] Carl Povilaitis: I mean, we're looking at the city of Glendale with 200,000 people. I don't think we need — if you look at the United States, 330 million people — but we're looking at 200,000 people, and if we're really trying to drive towards consensus, I don't think the mayor should have that much power. You need to really work toward building a consensus on council to get things done.

Post-Ballot Advocacy Prohibition — Key Staff Disclosure (01:47:09)

[01:47:09] John Takhtalian: Once the city council decides that they're going to put something on the ballot or have put something on the ballot, the advocacy piece has to end. The city can have informational sessions, but any type of advocacy really has to be grassroots, completely separate and apart from the city itself. For example, we wouldn't be able to hire consultants to drive a certain point home.

[01:47:47] Rachel Yoo: So the city cannot do the outreach, right? That's the answer.

[01:48:10] John Takhtalian: Correct.

Denise Miller — Outreach Process Critique and Proposal (01:36:25)

[01:38:00] Denise Miller: 262, that's the amount of people that did maps. Come on. You could draw your own map? I mean, I know it was fun and there was public comment and it was engaging and all of that. But this is so serious to open up a charter.

[01:39:35] Denise Miller: Our recommendation to council is the consultants has to be very directed to how they outreach with our public. They have to do the digital mapping. They have to go to South Glendale. They have to do GCC.

[01:40:40] Denise Miller: The message is, do you want districts or not? I mean, I'm driving by GCC. I got 4 seconds to catch something and be safe in Glendale. I have 4 seconds. Do you want districts or not?

Steven Flower — Public Awareness Observation (01:58:28)

[01:58:28] Steven Flower: For me, it's just awareness. I don't see the public is more aware whenever there's a duck race or a Glendale Tech Week. Honestly, there's more — I don't even want to use the engagement because it's just awareness. You're just aware that it's happening.

[01:59:34] Steven Flower: The public needs to be aware. And it should not, in my opinion, be any sort of engagement or advocacy one way or another. It's just, do you even know we're considering districts? Period.

[02:00:00] Steven Flower: People knew about trash cans changing way more than they knew about districts, which in my mind it's like open heart surgery.

Herbert Molano — Future Agendas: Comparative City Research Proposal (02:13:45)

[02:13:45] Herbert Molano: What if you were to go and investigate the cities that already have the type of districting that you are aiming for? And then see how effective they are.

[02:14:15] Herbert Molano: If you take a city right next to us, the city of Los Angeles, they have districting, they have a mayor with specific duties. How well did they perform during this situation with the fires? I would say that it's a dysfunctional city.

[02:14:40] Herbert Molano: I'm proposing that you bring up cities that have already the type of charter that you guys are aiming for and bring those examples and discuss them, because that will give you real-life evidence of what the actual outcome is when you have those cities and what kind of problems they have.

Elizabeth Manasserian — Voting Data Gap Observation (02:09:16)

[02:09:16] Elizabeth Manasserian: If one of the arguments is that the southern area is not being represented, then how they vote is important. If we look at the results of the voting, we need to look at how the South Glendale population voted when they had a choice to vote for someone from South Glendale or not.

[02:09:56] Stephen Meek: I think I understand your point. And I don't know how we get to that data.

[02:10:01] Elizabeth Manasserian: Right. So thank you.