



# LOS ANGELES GOVERNANCE REFORM PROJECT REPORT

PREPARED BY

ISA

OCTOBER 2023

# Table of Contents

<b>Background and Objectives.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Overall Findings.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Detailed Findings.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Notes .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Views on Los Angeles Government .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Los Angeles Leaders and City Officials .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Los Angeles City Council Size and Reform Options.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Expense of City Council Expansion .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Los Angeles Unified School District Reform Options .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>District Lines .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Corruption in the Los Angeles City Council .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Ethics Reform .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Demographic Profile.....</b>	<b>20</b>

## BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES

The LA Governance Reform Project (the LAGRP) was created by researchers with expertise on government and representation to address shortcomings in local governance for the City of Los Angeles. The Committee is independent, non-partisan, funded by philanthropic donations, and seeks only to assist the City of Los Angeles and its residents with reforming local institutions to improve the transparency, equity, ethical standards, and representational capacity of local governments.

In pursuit of these goals, the LAGRP engaged ISA to conduct quantitative research among residents of the City of Los Angeles to assess current feelings on City government and to ascertain support, opposition, and areas of concern with respect to reform proposals.

The objectives of this research are to:

1. Assess current feelings on the state of the City of Los Angeles and favorability towards officials
2. Understand residents' perception of Council representation
3. Understand residents' support or opposition on reform proposals
4. Determine differences by demographic backgrounds or political allegiance

The LAGRP plans to use insights from this research to inform recommendations to reform the government of the City of Los Angeles.

## OVERALL FINDINGS

- Angelenos are mixed when it comes to how they feel things are going in the city currently with half feeling things are going well and the other half feeling things are not so good.
- Similarly, there is a split between those that think the City of Los Angeles Government is effective and ineffective.
  - Some demographic skews do emerge. Males, younger adults, Caucasian and mixed ethnicity residents, more educated, higher income that have lived in LA for less than 30 years tend to have a more positive outlook on these measures than other demographic groups.
- Favorability ratings for city and state officials/departments are neither positive nor negative. Those that have a more positive outlook on the City and Government in general exhibit much more positive ratings for city officials and departments.
- Overall, residents feel their views only matter a little to city officials. Residents also feel that officials are too focused on big money interests. The more educated and higher income residents, however, do tend to believe their views are taken into careful consideration.
- Perhaps because residents don't feel their views are taken into consideration, most residents have not tried to contact a council member. There is a skew with demographics here as well. Ethnic groups, lower education and lower income are more likely NOT to have tried to contact a council member. More information on how to reach city officials put out on broadcast TV or social media could help educate this group on how and who to contact.
- Reaction to the reform proposals is generally positive. Residents would be in favor of increasing the number of council members from 15 to 25. Going up to 30 or more would not be recommended.
- Similarly, the proposal to increase the LAUSD Board was also well received. All residents (especially those with young children in the household) would support an increase from 7 members to 15 or more.
  - There is a concern though when it comes to the cost. The expense of paying for more council members and office staff is important to the residents in their decision to support the expansion of the council.
  - If part of the proposal included a cap or maximum expense, that would help sway or solidify support of the expansion proposals.

## OVERALL FINDINGS

- Generally, there is a feeling that LA City has a fair amount of corruption. The more “connected” a resident is (more educated, higher income) the less belief there is corruption, however.
- There is widespread support for ethics rules reform. The proposal with the most favorability is “Strengthening rules regarding lobbyists, gifts and/or campaign contributions”.
- When District lines need to be re-drawn, residents feel it is better and will help to reduce corruption if a neutral party or commission were to do the redistricting.
  - In fact, if on the ballot today, most would vote in favor of a redistricting commission for both LA City and LAUSD School districts.
- Another bad look is having council members decide on land use deals. Residents feel this will invite more corruption and would not be a good idea.

## DETAILED FINDINGS

### Notes:

Among residents surveyed for this research the median time lived in the city of Los Angeles is 29 years. Most are registered to vote (92%), with about 4 in 10 claiming to be Liberal/Progressive, 4 in 10 Moderate/M of R, and 2 in 10 Conservative.

In terms of the primary source for news and information about important matters, residents surveyed indicate television as a main source (27% broadcast TV and 23% Cable stations), just over one-third indicate they get news from online sources (21% social media and 16% internet news). Radio, Newspapers and Podcasts collectively are the source for about 1 in 10 residents.

When asked how frequently various sources are used for news and information about politics and government *in Los Angeles*, 4 in 10 say they use Local TV Stations daily. Just over half indicate they almost never use community focused papers like The Sentinel or La Opinion.

### Views on Los Angeles Government

Residents have mixed feelings about how things have been going in Los Angeles recently, with half saying “Excellently” or “Pretty well” and half “Not so good” or “Poorly”.

- Residents that have lived in Los Angeles for less than 30 years, males, those with liberal/progressive views, younger adults, those of Caucasian or mixed ethnicity, more educated with higher income and those having children in the household under 18 years of age index higher on having a positive impression of how things have been going in Los Angeles recently.

Overall, how would you say things in Los Angeles have been going recently?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
<b>T2B</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>50%</b>
Excellently	201	12%
Pretty well	606	37%
<b>B2B</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>50%</b>
Not so good	571	35%
Poorly	247	15%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Overall, how would you say things in Los Angeles have been going recently?

	Total Percent	INDEX TO TOTAL											
		Male	18-29	30-39	40-49	White	Other/Mixed	Post Grad	\$100K+	Kids in HH <18	Liberal	Lived in LA <10 yrs.	Lived in LA 10-29 yrs.
<b>T2B</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>106</b>
Excellently	12%	133	100	183	158	158	267	275	175	200	150	158	92
Pretty well	37%	105	130	92	86	103	81	100	97	89	124	111	114
<b>B2B</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>94</b>
Not so good	35%	89	89	94	106	80	77	63	83	86	80	86	100
Poorly	15%	100	60	73	80	100	73	53	93	80	53	67	80
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>584</b>

When asked about the Los Angeles City Government effectiveness, just over half of all residents rated it as “Very” or “Somewhat” effective (55%). A majority of those that feel the City Government is effective *also* feel things in Los Angeles have been going well recently (68%).

- Residents that have lived in Los Angeles for less than 30 years, liberals, those of Caucasian or mixed ethnicity, more educated with higher income and those having children in the household under 18 years of age index higher on feeling the City Government is effective.

How would you describe the government of the City of Los Angeles. Would you say it is very effective, somewhat effective, somewhat ineffective, or very ineffective?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
<b>T2B</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>55%</b>
Very effective	204	13%
Somewhat effective	694	43%
<b>B2B</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>45%</b>
Somewhat ineffective	481	30%
Very ineffective	245	15%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

How would you describe the government of the City of Los Angeles. Would you say it is very effective, somewhat effective, somewhat ineffective, or very ineffective?

	Total Percent	INDEX TO TOTAL											
		Male	18-29	30-39	40-49	White	Other/ Mixed	Post Grad	\$100K+	Kids in HH <18	Liberal	Lived in LA <10 yrs.	Lived in LA 10-29 yrs.
<b>T2B</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>104</b>
Very effective	13%	123	69	146	162	146	231	246	154	177	138	154	92
Somewhat effective	43%	93	109	86	81	93	81	93	88	91	112	93	105
<b>B2B</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>96</b>
Somewhat ineffective	30%	93	110	103	93	77	63	60	87	90	87	100	100
Very ineffective	15%	107	73	87	107	120	113	67	107	73	53	67	87
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>584</b>

How things in Los Angeles have been going recently	Total Percent	City of Los Angeles Government Effectiveness					
		Effective			Ineffective		
		Very/ Somewhat	Very	Somewhat	Very/ Somewhat	Somewhat	Very
<b>T2B</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>
Excellently	12%	19%	60%	6%	5%	3%	8%
Pretty well	37%	50%	28%	56%	22%	28%	9%
<b>B2B</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>84%</b>
Not so good	35%	25%	6%	31%	47%	56%	30%
Poorly	15%	7%	5%	7%	26%	12%	54%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>



## Los Angeles Leaders and City Officials

Respondents were asked to rate their favorability of various government personnel and departments. Overall, results are not strongly positive nor are they strongly negative. In many cases, residents provide a neutral rating or claim not to have enough information to have an opinion.

- Highest favorability ratings were received for Governor Gavin Newsom and Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass.
- Favorability is lowest for the Los Angeles City Council and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.
- Liberals, and (perhaps not surprisingly) those that feel things in Los Angeles are going well or feel the LA City Government is effective are much more favorable to all government personnel and departments.

For each of the following, please tell us whether your view is favorable or unfavorable. (Avg. mean 5 pt. scale 5=Very Favorable, 1=Very unfavorable, 3=Neutral)

	Total Mean	Male	18-29	30-39	40-49	White	Other/Mixed	Post Grad	\$100K+	Kids in HH <18	Liberal	Lived in LA <10 yrs.	Lived in LA 10-29 yrs.
Gavin Newsom	3.36	3.34	3.17	3.34	3.38	3.53	3.59	4.02	3.50	3.57	3.84	3.42	3.32
Karen Bass	3.31	3.33	3.07	3.42	3.41	3.59	3.56	3.93	3.55	3.54	3.72	3.38	3.21
Your Neighborhood Council in the City	3.21	3.28	3.12	3.41	3.31	3.38	3.50	3.80	3.39	3.51	3.47	3.37	3.25
LA USD	3.21	3.36	3.08	3.47	3.37	3.36	3.41	3.74	3.38	3.53	3.48	3.45	3.24
Alberto Carvalho	3.17	3.28	3.03	3.36	3.33	3.36	3.39	3.64	3.33	3.45	3.42	3.37	3.16
CA Legislature	3.15	3.23	3.09	3.30	3.25	3.38	3.51	3.84	3.39	3.48	3.56	3.34	3.18
LA USB	3.12	3.26	2.91	3.37	3.30	3.37	3.33	3.78	3.37	3.45	3.36	3.33	3.16
LA County Board of Supervisors	3.05	3.12	3.00	3.23	3.24	3.25	3.27	3.64	3.24	3.38	3.35	3.25	3.14
LA City Council	3.03	3.11	3.01	3.24	3.24	3.19	3.33	3.71	3.22	3.42	3.31	3.31	3.10
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>584</b>

	Total Mean	Status of LA Recently				Effectiveness of LA City Government			
		Excellent	Pretty Well	Not So Good	Poor	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Gavin Newsom	3.36	4.29	3.72	3.07	2.35	4.45	3.79	2.95	2.05
Karen Bass	3.31	4.15	3.67	3.00	2.37	4.21	3.69	3.00	2.08
Your Neighborhood Council in the City	3.21	4.12	3.43	2.92	2.42	4.36	3.43	2.9	2.17
LA USD	3.21	4.28	3.50	2.86	2.27	4.42	3.48	2.84	2.10
Alberto Carvalho	3.17	4.09	3.37	2.85	2.37	4.33	3.32	2.80	2.36
CA Legislature	3.15	4.19	3.54	2.74	2.13	4.41	3.44	2.77	2.01
LA USB	3.12	4.22	3.34	2.80	2.19	4.39	3.35	2.77	2.04
LA County Board of Supervisors	3.05	4.18	3.38	2.66	1.99	4.30	3.35	2.66	1.89
LA City Council	3.03	4.21	3.39	2.62	2.04	4.34	3.31	2.68	1.86
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>



Only one in four Los Angeles City residents feel their views (and those of others like them) are carefully considered by city officials. About half feel their views matter only a little and almost one-third feel their views have almost no impact. This sentiment is likely part of the reason for the lower favorability ratings.

- Residents with higher education, and those with positive feelings towards Los Angeles in general as well as those that feel the LA Government is effective are much more likely to feel their views are carefully considered by city officials.

Residents feel that the leaders focus most of their attention on big money interests, lobbyists, and developers (66%).

- Similarly, higher educated and those with positive views of the City/Government more strongly believe leaders are well connected with their constituents.

Would you say that your views and the views of others like you are carefully considered, matter a little, or have almost no impact?

My Views (are/have):	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Carefully considered	424	26%
Matter only a little	708	44%
Almost no impact	492	30%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Which comes closer to your view?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Leaders are closely connected to the population	550	34%
Leaders focus on big money interests	1,074	66%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

	INDEX TO TOTAL									
	Total Percent	Status of LA Recently					Effectiveness of LA City Government			
		Post Grad	Excellent	Pretty Well	Not So Good	Poor	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Carefully considered	26%	196	288	131	35	23	315	96	50	38
Matter only a little	44%	73	41	116	120	59	30	130	114	41
Almost no impact	30%	53	27	50	127	227	20	60	123	240
Leaders are closely connected to the population	34%	165	226	135	50	24	241	121	38	25
Leaders focus on big money interests	66%	67	35	82	126	139	27	89	132	133
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>

Interestingly, while many residents do not believe their views are carefully considered, more than half have never attempted to contact a member of the City Council or their office (60%). Of those that have contacted a member of the City Council, more than half say they were not able to get the help they were looking for.

Have you ever attempted to contact a member of the city council or their office? If yes, what was your experience?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes, and was able to receive help	261	16%
Yes, but did not get anyone to help me	310	19%
Yes, while not able to help I was satisfied with response	85	5%
No	968	60%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

- Males, mid aged adults (between 30 and 50 years of age), those of Caucasian or mixed ethnicity, more educated with higher income, married with kids in the HH are more likely to have contacted members of the city council and to be satisfied with the result. Liberals and residents that feel things in Los Angeles are going well or feel the LA City Government is effective also skew this direction.

	Total Percent	INDEX TO TOTAL									
		Male	30-39	40-49	White	Other/ Mixed	Post Grad	\$100K+	Married	Kids in HH <18	Liberal
Yes, and was able to receive help	16%	138	150	150	175	213	238	175	138	181	138
Yes, but did not get anyone to help me	19%	105	121	68	105	95	100	95	89	95	105
Yes, while not able to help I was satisfied with response	5%	120	140	140	80	120	100	80	120	140	140
No	60%	87	78	95	82	70	63	83	92	77	85
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>652</b>

	Total Percent	Status of LA Recently				Effectiveness of LA City Government			
		Excellent	Pretty Well	Not So Good	Poor	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Yes, and was able to receive help	16%	400	94	38	25	381	75	38	56
Yes, but did not get anyone to help me	19%	63	100	100	137	53	95	105	147
Yes, while not able to help I was satisfied with response	5%	80	160	00	100	100	100	100	120
No	60%	33	98	120	108	40	108	115	95
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>

## Los Angeles City Council Size and Reform Options

Just over half of all residents surveyed (57%) feel that the current districts are too large, that each should have fewer people for a council member to represent. This is a fairly universal finding by sub-groups.

After being exposed to examples of other cities where the number of residents per district is fewer than Los Angeles, the majority of those that felt the current district size of Los Angeles seemed OK kept that opinion (70%).

**LA City Council has 15 members, for about 270,000 people per district. Would you say ...**

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
These are too large. Each district should have fewer people for a council member	926	57%
This number of districts and their size seems OK	698	43%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Compared to other places (Chicago, San Francisco, New York) that have fewer people per district, would you say ...**

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
These are too large. Each district should have fewer people for a council member	207	30%
This number of districts and their size seems OK	491	70%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>100%</b>

When asked if residents would favor an increase to the size of the city council from 15 to at least 21 (and thereby lowering the number of citizens per council member), three-quarters (76%) say they are in favor of that proposal. Most of that group (87%) would also favor an increase up to at least 25 council members.

**Would you favor increasing the size of the city council from 15 to at least 21?**

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes	1,227	76%
No	397	24%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Would you favor increasing the size of the city council from 15 to at least 25?**

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes	1,065	87%
No	162	13%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,227</b>	<b>100%</b>

All participants were asked if they would favor an increase to as many as 30 or more council members. This is not a recommended option as just over half (52%) of the Los Angeles residents surveyed would NOT support an increase of that size. Of the 48% that would support 30 or more council members, the median number mentioned each district should have is 35.

- Sub-groups supporting an increase to 30 or more council members include those aged 30-39, with Post Graduate degrees, with children in the household, living in the city less than 10 years. Additionally, residents that have positive feelings about the status of the city or feel the City Government is effective also support this larger increase.

Would you favor increasing the size of the city council from 15 to 30 or more than 30?

		INDEX TO TOTAL											
		Status of LA Recently						Effectiveness of LA City Government					
	Total Percent	30-39	Post Grad	Kids in HH <18	Lived in LA <10 yrs.	Excellent	Pretty Well	Not So Good	Poor	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Yes	48%	125	121	123	119	158	104	92	67	158	9	96	75
No	52%	40	81	79	83	56	96	108	131	56	104	104	123
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>

Another idea proposed to participants of this research is to set aside “at-large” seats to represent the whole city. About 6 in 10 residents initially say they would be in favor of having some seats elected at-large. Under the assumption that some seats in the city council would be set aside for as “at-large”, about 4 in 10 would prefer at-large seats elected across groups of four to five districts while 3 in 10 would prefer at-large seats elected city wide.

- Younger residents 18-29 years of age, and residents with a positive outlook on the status of the City or those that feel the City Government is effective are more likely to favor “at-large” council seats.

Would you favor having at least some seats elected at-large?

		INDEX TO TOTAL								
		Status of LA Recently					Effectiveness of LA City Government			
	Total Percent	18-29	Excellent	Pretty Well	Not So Good	Poor	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Yes	61%	120	131	107	90	77	130	103	90	80
No	39%	69	51	90	115	136	54	95	115	131
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>

Would you prefer all seats to represent the entire city or to have each seat represent 4-5 council districts?

		INDEX TO TOTAL								
		Status of LA Recently					Effectiveness of LA City Government			
	Total Percent	18-29	Excellent	Pretty Well	Not So Good	Poor	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
City wide	29%	100	200	100	76	69	207	86	76	83
Groups of four to five districts	44%	130	64	109	111	89	57	111	111	84
None	27%	52	52	85	107	152	56	96	104	144
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>245</b>

## Expense of City Council Expansion

The cost associated with paying more council members, staff and increased office expenses to expand the number of council members is “Very” or “Somewhat” important to nearly 9 of 10 residents.

- This trend is consistent among sub-groups.

Having a limit to the total cost associated with council expansion may encourage support of an expansion as about 65% indicate it would make them “Much More” or “Somewhat More” likely to support the proposal.

- This trend is consistent among sub-groups.

How important would the costs of government be to you as you consider whether to support council expansion?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
<b>T2B</b>	<b>1,375</b>	<b>85%</b>
Very important	680	42%
Somewhat important	695	43%
<b>B2B</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>15%</b>
Not very important	174	11%
Not important at all	75	5%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

If the proposal to expand the council put a limit on the total costs of the council and their offices (for example less than 1% of total city budget) would this make you ..?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Much more likely to support	414	26%
Somewhat more likely to support	641	39%
No effect on my views	568	35%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Los Angeles Unified School District Reform Options

With only 7 members of the School Board and about 600,000 residents in each district, participants in the research were asked if they would favor increasing the size of the School Board to at least 11 members, which would in turn reduce the number of residents per council member to about 382,000. Nearly three-quarters (71%) indicated they would be in favor.

Of that group, 8 of 10 said they would be in favor of increasing the size to 15 School Board members, and almost 8 in 10 of those also favor an increase to more than 15 members.

Among those in support of expanding to more than 15 LAUSD Board members, the median number of members desired is 20.

Would you favor increasing the size of the School Board from 7 to at least 11?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes	1,151	71%
No	473	29%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Would you favor increasing the size of the School Board from 7 to 15?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes	960	83%
No	192	17%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,151</b>	<b>100%</b>

Would you favor increasing the size of the School Board from 7 to more than 15?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes	748	78%
No	211	22%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>100%</b>

## District Lines

When asked about their thoughts on how District lines should be drawn, three-fourths (76%) of Los Angeles residents state this should be done by a neutral party. Similarly, most residents stated they would vote FOR an independent redistricting commission for the City Council districts (75%) and FOR an independent redistricting commission for the School Board districts (76%).

Are district lines better drawn by officials who run for election or by a neutral agency?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Neutral party	1,239	76%
Elected officials	385	24%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Assuming a minimum requirement that commissioners have lived in Los Angeles for 3 years, half of the residents that participated in the research believe that only citizens who are registered to vote should be eligible to serve as a member of an independent redistricting commission.

If on the ballot today, would you vote for or against an independent redistricting commission?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
I would vote FOR independent redistricting	1,222	75%
I would vote AGAINST independent redistricting	401	25%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

I would vote FOR independent redistricting for the School Board districts	1,230	76%
I would vote AGAINST independent redistricting for the School Board districts	394	24%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Who do you think should be eligible for these commissions? Assume a minimum requirement that they live in LA City for 3 years.

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Only citizens registered to vote	812	50%
All citizens, registered to vote or not	333	21%
All adults, lawfully living in Los Angeles	240	15%
All adults in Los Angeles	238	15%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Corruption in the Los Angeles City Council

Eight in ten Angelenos feel the level of corruption in the Los Angeles City Council should at least raise concern and/or is more than most government bodies.

- Residents that are happy with how things are going in LA currently or feel the LA City Government is effective are more likely to say there have been very few corruption problems.

When asked about the ethics rules that regulate the actions of elected officials, 9 of 10 feel rules should be made stronger. Half say the rules are too lax and should be made much stronger and another 40% say the rules are “OK” but should be made just a bit stronger.

- Again, residents that are happy with how things are going in LA currently or feel the LA City Government is effective are more likely to say the rules do not require reform.

Three-quarters of residents believe that having council members hold power over land use decisions (which development projects are permitted and which are not) is a bad idea and invites more corruption.

About two-thirds of the residents that participated in this research are aware of the recording of three city council members after a debate surrounding the drawing of district lines. One-third indicated they heard the recording, about one-third did not hear it, but heard *about it* from the news or friends/family.

How would you rate the LA City Council overall with respect to the levels of corruption?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Has had very few problems	318	20%
Has had enough corruption problems to raise concern	880	54%
Has more problems than most government bodies	427	26%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Do you think the ethics rules that regulate the actions of elected officials should be reformed and made stronger?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Rules are too lax and need to be made much stronger	767	47%
The rules are doing OK, but could be a bit stronger	681	42%
Rules are functioning well and do not require reform	176	11%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Do you think having council members hold power over what development are built or not built creates a danger of corruption?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes, this is a bad idea	1,224	75%
No, the council is best suited for these decisions	400	25%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>

Have you heard about the recording of three council members thought to be using offensive / racist language?

	Weighted Frequency	Percent
Yes, I heard the recording	554	34%
I did not hear the recording but heard about it	504	31%
I have not heard about this recording	566	35%
<b>Weighted Base</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>100%</b>



## **Ethics Reform**

In general, residents are in favor of ethics proposals that are meant to strengthen requirements and reduce corruption. Residents would be in favor of:

- Strengthening rules regarding lobbyists, gifts and/or campaign contributions (3.3 mean on a 4 point scale, where 4=Strongly favor)
- Establishing rules governing the Ethics Commission budget so that the City Council is unable to threaten budget cuts to pressure the commission (3.22 mean on a 4 point scale, where 4=Strongly favor)
- Give the City Ethics Commission greater resources including staff and budget to do better enforcement (3.12 mean on a 4 point scale, where 4=Strongly favor)
- Give the City Ethics Commission the power to put reform proposals on the ballot for public vote without the City Council having to approve it (3.05 mean on a 4 point scale, where 4=Strongly favor)
- Remove land use decisions from the hands of the city council (3.01 mean on a 4 point scale, where 4=Strongly favor)

## METHODOLOGY

The quantitative survey data collected for this research project consisted of two modes of collection:

- (A) An internet survey sample at city of Los Angeles level
- (B) A computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) phone sample at the city of Los Angeles level

### Internet Sample Information:

ISA used its proprietary database to send invitations to Los Angeles City residents to participate in the internet study. ISA also has access to many online panels partners and databases with millions of respondents that can be reached via email or through online portals. The online panels are recruited from multiple channels, including online, telephone, mobile, face-to-face, social media, and print. ISA conducts thousands of surveys every month for their clients using these databases.

### CATI Phone Sample Information:

The STS Listed Landline Sampling Database is based upon a variety of consumer data and consists of landline telephones, complete with name, address, and hundreds of robust data elements from which to select. The initial point of compilation is telephone white page data and is augmented with many different data sources including product purchase data, warranty card information, survey data, magazine subscriptions, survey data, and other similar sources. Additional information is appended using public record information and census data.

The STS Enhanced-Wireless™ Sampling Database is based upon a very large database of known wireless phones and self-reported data that is collected using a variety of proprietary techniques. Using Enhanced-Wireless™, samples can be targeted to specific demographic groups, including age, income, gender, presence of children, and ethnic groups – just to name a few. Enhanced-Wireless™ was developed by STS using a proprietary set of databases that includes product purchase data, warranty card information, survey data, and many other similar sources of information.

Given two modes of collection of survey responses based on convenience sampling, the LAGRP Survey data arises from non-probability (non-random) sampling design. That is, the probability of selection of residents of Los Angeles city for either mode at city, district or neighborhood level was not developed beforehand based on list or geographical frame.

The primary data collection was conducted between October 6 and October 20, 2023. A total of 1,624 Los Angeles City residents participated in the research; 600 collected via phone and 1,024 via online interviews. All of the data collection was conducted by Interviewing Service of American (ISA).

To make sure only city residents participated in the study, potential participants were asked for the zip code of their current residence. If outside the city of Los Angeles zip list, the interview was rejected. The screener consisted of about 10 questions including age (must have been 18+), gender, and ethnicity of participants, and quotas were set based ethnicity and mode (see table below for quota targets).

If a person who completed the screener belonged to a group whose quota had not been met, then the participant was rejected.

**Quota Targets:**

Minimum Quotas by method	Phone - 600	Online - 1000	Total - 1600
White (Gen pop sampling)	200	400	600
Hispanic (Gen pop sampling)	200	400	600
Black - Total	100	100	200
Black (under 40 yrs. - sub quota of Total)	30	30	60
Other	As it falls	As it falls	0
Total Asian	100	100	200
Filipino	As it falls	As it falls	0
Chinese	As it falls	As it falls	0
Korean	As it falls	As it falls	0
Other Asian	As it falls	As it falls	As it falls
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>1600</b>

Quotas by Ethnicity (minimums):	
White	400
Latino	400
Black (min of n=100 under 40 yrs.)	200
Asian	200
Other/Mixed ethnicity	no quotas

**Actuals:**

Minimum Quotas by method	Phone - 600	Online - 1024	Total - 1624
White (Gen pop sampling)	160	380	540
Hispanic (Gen pop sampling)	206	300	506
Black - Total	109	105	214
Black (under 40 yrs. - sub quota of Total)	27	42	69
Total Asian	105	105	210
Other/Mixed	20	134	154
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>1024</b>	<b>1624</b>

To compensate for the non-random sampling, we used weighting techniques to make the sample reflect the city’s age within gender, ethnic and income characteristics as much as possible. Using this approach, we can generally apply the results provided by the survey participants to residents who were not surveyed but share their demographic characteristics.

This table shows the breakdown of various demographic variables in this survey. Frequency shows the unweighted number of valid survey responses, followed by the unweighted percent of total.

The weighted percent shows the percentages for valid responses used in the analysis after weights are applied. The weights were developed using the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) Data.

	Frequency	Unweighted Percent	Weighted Percent	ACS Census Percent Los Angeles City Adults 18+
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	801	49.3	50.2	50.2
Male	823	50.6	49.8	49.8
Total	1,624	100	100	100
<b>Gender/Age</b>				
Female 18-39	397	24.4	21.4	21.4
Female 40-59	250	15.4	15.2	15.2
Female 60+	154	9.5	13.6	13.6
Male 18-39	386	23.6	22.5	22.5
Male 40-59	321	19.8	16.0	16.0
Male 60+	116	7.1	11.3	11.3
Total	1,624	100	100	100
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Hispanic	506	31.2	43.5	43.5
African American (non-Hispanic)	214	13.2	9.6	9.6
Asian (non-Hispanic)	210	12.9	14.1	14.1
Caucasian / Other	694	42.7	32.8	32.8
Total	1,624	100	100	100
<b>Income</b>				
Under \$50,000	450	27.7	35.0	35.0
\$50,000 - \$99,999	670	41.3	26.1	26.1
\$100,000+	504	31.0	38.9	38.9
Total	1,624	100	100	100

## DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Base (unw)	1624
Base (unw)	1624
<b>Language for survey:</b>	
English	1408
	87%
Spanish	216
	13%
<b>Race or Ethnicity (multi-select)</b>	
White, not-Hispanic	484
	30%
Hispanic or Latino	772
	48%
Black or African American	185
	11%
Asian or Pacific Islander	241
	15%
Native American	21
	1%
Middle East or North African	8
	1%
Other	15
	1%
<b>Race breakdown (single select)</b>	
White	430
	26%
Hispanic	703
	43%
African American	156
	10%
Asian	230
	14%
Other/Mixed ethnicity	105
	6%

Base (unw)	1624
Base (unw)	1624
<b>How long have you lived in Los Angeles?</b>	
Under 5 years	134
	8%
5 to 9 years	103
	6%
10 to 19 years	255
	16%
20 to 29 years	329
	20%
30+ years	803
	49%
Mean	29.23
Median	29
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	817
	50%
Male	805
	50%
I identify another way	2
	0%
<b>Age Category</b>	
18 to 29	297
	18%
30 to 39	418
	26%
40 to 49	281
	17%
50 to 59	228
	14%
60 or older	400
	25%

<i>Base (unw)</i>	1624
<i>Base (unw)</i>	1624
<b>Education</b>	
Did not complete high school	78
	5%
High school graduate or GED	341
	21%
Vocational or technical school	93
	6%
Some college, but no degree yet	314
	19%
2-year degree / Associate's degree	123
	8%
4-year degree / Bachelor's degree	468
	29%
Post-graduate degree	207
	13%
<b>Registered to Vote</b>	
Yes	1496
	92%
No	128
	8%
<b>Political Views</b>	
Liberal/Progressive	652
	40%
Moderate/M-of-R	644
	40%
Conservative	328
	20%
<b>Where Born</b>	
United States	1207
	74%
Island of Puerto Rico	6
	0%
Another country	411
	25%

<i>Base (unw)</i>	1624
<i>Base (unw)</i>	1624
<b>Primary Source for News &amp; Info</b>	
Broadcast Television like NBC, CBS, and ABC	440
	27%
Cable Television like Fox, MSNBC, or CNN	374
	23%
News and Talk Radio	104
	6%
Internet News	266
	16%
Social media like Instagram, Facebook, TikTok, or Twitter (now called X)	336
	21%
Newspapers	77
	5%
Podcasts	27
	2%
<i>Base (unw) Hispanics</i>	605
<i>Base (unw) Hispanics</i>	772
<b>Consume news primarily English, Spanish or both</b>	
All English	191
	25%
Mostly English with occasional Spanish	211
	27%
About 50/50	193
	25%
Mostly Spanish with occasional English	90
	12%
All Spanish	88
	11%

Base (unw)	1624
Base (unw)	1624
<b>Income</b>	
(35) Less than \$40,000	381
	23%
(45) Between \$40,000 and \$49,999	189
	12%
(55) Between \$50,000 and \$59,999	119
	7%
(70) Between \$60,000 and \$79,999	172
	11%
(90) Between \$80,000 and \$99,999	134
	8%
(125) Between \$100,000 and \$149,999	316
	19%
(175) Between \$150,000 and \$199,999	176
	11%
(200) Greater than \$200,000	136
	8%
Mean	\$92,390
<b>Marital Status</b>	
Married	767
	47%
Living with a partner, but not married	166
	10%
Single	507
	31%
Widowed	78
	5%
Divorced	106
	7%

Base (unw)	1624
Base (unw)	1624
<b>Children</b>	
I have children under age 18 who live with me	507
	31%
I have children age 18 or older who live with me	177
	11%
I have children age 18 or older who live on their own	291
	18%
I have grandchildren under age 18 who live with me	67
	4%
I do not have any children	682
	42%
Net: Have children	942
	58%



Base (unw)	1624
Base (unw)	1624
<b>Employment (multi select)</b>	
Employed full-time	844
	52%
Employed part-time	174
	11%
Not working, currently looking for work	110
	7%
Self-employed	154
	9%
Full-time student	59
	4%
Retired	236
	15%
Take care of family full-time	63
	4%
Not working due to disability or illness	47
	3%
I work as a professional, lawyer, doctor, business person, accountant or similar	40
	2%
I work in an office, doing secretarial, bills, benefits, or other clerical work.	25
	2%
I work in a store, restaurant, or other business, not in the office.	21
	1%
I work in construction, maintenance, landscaping or other manual jobs	31
	2%