CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2025 AT 7:00 PM

AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS JR. COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1424 MISSION STREET, SOUTH PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91030

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Additional Documents to the March 5, 2025 City Council Meeting. The attached documents include submitted written public comments and amendments to the agenda. Submit by no later than 12:00 p.m., on the day of the City Council meeting. Correspondence received after this time will be distributed the following business day.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO THE MARCH 5, 2025 CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS

- General Public Comment_Yvonne LaRose
- General Public Comment_Yvonne LaRose (2)
- General Public Comment_Kyle Bollin
- General Public Comment_Ed Elsner
- General Public Comment_Rachael Faught
- General Public Comment_Casey Dukes

From: Yvonne LaRose
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment 3/5/25: State Treasurer Workshop re Funding Opportunities
Date: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 3:23:38 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

On Thursday, March 13 California State Treasurer Fiona Ma will conduct a workshop at the MegaMix Expo (Santa Anita Park, 285 W. Huntington Dr., Arcadia) regarding

Updates on California State Resources: Grants, Loans and Bond Programs.

Treasurer Fiona Ma will explore vital state financial resources and programs.

It will cover the California Capital Access Program (CalCAP), providing significant lending opportunities for small businesses, alongside critical grant and bond programs. Learn about essential funding initiatives, including cybersecurity and nonprofit security grants, specialized opportunities for disadvantaged individuals (SEDI), and the California Dream For All program for first-time homebuyers.
Treasurer Ma will guide attendees through accessing no-cost business consulting, training programs, and diverse funding opportunities through California's comprehensive resource network.

The admission fee to attend this workshop (and all other events on that day) is $35.

It may be advantageous for at least one representative from our city government to attend this workshop, in particular, as the city attempts to identify revenue sources to empower the several improvement programs presently before us.

Viva
Yvonne LaRose, CAC
Management, Organization, Development Consultant

From: Yvonne LaRose
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment 3/5/25: South Pasadena as a Sanctuary City Proclamation
Date: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 4:00:47 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have come to this body on two different occasions, both verbally and in person, to request that the City declare it is a Sanctuary City with regard to two matters

- immigrant matters
- healthcare counseling and procedures, particularly with regard to pregnancy options

Considering the real and expanding net being cast by our federal government with respect to these two issues, I now vehemently ask that this city, like our neighbors Alhambra, Eagle Rock, and Highland Park, declare itself a Sanctuary City.

Immigration
At present, our police department uses the provisions of SB 54 (enacted January 1, 2018) which limits cooperation between local law enforcement and federal immigration agencies. They already have achieved upholding recognizing that all of those who dwell here are entitled to equity and justice, without respect to ethnicity, religion, age, ability, gender, or gender identity. In that regard, I see a 95% improvement that has occurred since 2021.

It would be good to provide our law enforcement agency with the strength that derives from a Sanctuary City proclamation that emphasizes the importance and value we hold regarding safety from fear of harm for those who are in our borders when it comes to these two matters.

Healthcare and Abortion
In November 2022, Californians approved Prop 1, which explicitly adds abortion and contraception rights to the state constitution. CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 123468.

In addition to that Code, there are multiple bills also adopted by our state legislature that protect abortion counseling and rights, including:

- AB 1666 - Protects people and entities from civil liability for providing, aiding, or receiving abortion care
- SB 345 - Protects reproductive health care services, including abortion, and gender-affirming care services
- AB 352 - Enhances privacy protections for electronic medical records related to abortion
- AB 571 - Prohibits insurers from refusing to provide malpractice insurance to providers who offer abortion
- AB 1720 - Clarifies that ultrasounds and similar medical imaging devices must be offered in licensed facilities or by licensed providers
- Abortion Accessibility Act - Removes cost barriers to abortion care
- Medical Abortion Access - Shields manufacturers, distributors, and healthcare providers

from civil or criminal liability for accessing, mailing, or distributing medication abortion

- Attorney General Enforcement of the Reproductive Privacy Act - Allows state prosecutors to seek penalties against local governments that interfere with reproductive rights
- California also has interstate shield laws that protect patients, providers, and people who help others access abortion from out-of-state legal actions.

For the sake of those seeking immigration and healthcare decisions and procedures in South Pasadena, I, for the third time, urge the City to declare, by way of a proclamation, that South Pasadena is a Sanctuary City and will uphold the rights and safety of those who are here.

Viva
Yvonne LaRose, CAC
Organization Development Consultant:
Diversity/Title VII, Harassment, Ethics

From: Kyle Bollin
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment for City Council Meeting
Date: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:28:49 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good evening, Councilmembers.

I am speaking tonight with a deep sense of disappointment following the last meeting where the council voted not to consider rent stabilization in our city. Many of us, particularly renters, are struggling with the rapidly increasing cost of living, and the decision to not address this critical issue is disheartening. Renters are finding it harder each month to make ends meet, and we are asking for the council's leadership in finding solutions to help alleviate this burden. Rent stabilization would be a step in the right direction, and it's frustrating to see this vital issue sidelined.

Additionally, I'd like to express my concern regarding a potential conflict of interest. It has come to my attention that Councilmember Primuth has had stock in two high-end home building businesses.

Furthermore, Councilmember Primuth represents small landlords in his law firm, which may also influence his position on housing issues, especially those affecting tenants. As an example, last year there was a property on Mill Road that evicted tenants last year. It's crucial that the public has confidence in the integrity of our elected officials, and I would appreciate further clarification on how Councilmember Primuth intends to address these concerns and ensure transparency moving forward.

I urge the Council to revisit the issue of rent stabilization and to carefully consider any potential conflicts of interest that may be impacting the decisions being made. Thank you for your time and consideration.It's important for the public to know that our elected officials are acting in our best interests, free from any potential personal gain.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

From:	Ed Elsner
To:	City Council Public Comment
Cc:	CCO
Subject:	Public Comment, Regular Meeting, March 5, 2025 -- Item 2, Public Comment - General (Non-Agenda Items)
Date:	Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:50:18 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Braun, Mayor Pro Tem Rossi, and Councilmembers Cacciotti, Ferguson, and Primuth:

For your consideration, here are some suggestions for local tenant protections that would not require rent stabilization. These protections would have minimal financial impact on the city and impose minimal burden on city staff.

1. **Update the city's just cause eviction ordinance so that it is at least as protective as the state Tenant Protection Act ("TPA").** The TPA has been amended twice since the city's ordinance was enacted, and the city's ordinance is now less protective than the TPA with respect to certain "no-fault" evictions, such as owner move-in evictions. The city ordinance should be at least as protective as the TPA, and where the city ordinance is more protective, the local provisions should be retained.

2. **Protect South Pasadena students, teachers, and school district employees from no-fault evictions during the school year.** The city should consider amending the just cause eviction ordinance to preclude "no-fault" evictions of students, teachers, and school district employees during the school year. These eviction protections were adopted by the City and County of San Francisco and validated in a published appellate decision.

3. **Require landlords to serve and post a notice of tenant protections.** This would go a long way towards educating both landlords and tenants about existing tenant protection laws. This protection could be enforced by amending the just cause eviction ordinance to provide that a landlord's failure to serve and post the tenant protection notice may be asserted as an affirmative defense in an eviction lawsuit. No staff time would be spent monitoring or enforcing this protection; it would be up to the tenant to assert the affirmative defense in court if an eviction lawsuit is filed. An approved protection notice form could be drafted and made available for download

from the city's website. The City of Los Angeles has adopted this protection.

4. **Require eviction notices to be filed with the Housing Division within a specified period of time (e.g., 5 days) after service on the tenant.** This would help provide much needed data for policy making, including whether the evicting landlord is a "mom and pop" landlord or a corporate entity, whether the eviction is "no fault" or based on a lease violation, information about monthly rental amounts, etc. The protection could also be enforced by amending the just cause eviction ordinance to provide that a landlord's failure to timely file the eviction notice may be asserted as an affirmative defense in an eviction lawsuit. This protection should not result in a high volume of filings, and the burden on staff to accept the documents over the counter for filing and maintain the filed notices as official records would not be onerous. The records could be reviewed as needed to help inform policy making. The City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and City and County of San Francisco have adopted variations on this protection.

5. **Consider additional protections to help mitigate displacement of existing tenants.** The city should consider amending the just cause eviction ordinance to increase the amount of relocation assistance for tenants who are being evicted for "no-fault reasons." (The ordinance incorporates the TPA relocation assistance amount of one month's rent.) Increased relocation assistance would help mitigate the impacts of displacement on the most vulnerable of the city's tenants, such as elderly tenants on fixed incomes and low-income tenants. There is opportunity to be creative with respect to balancing interests, with different relocation assistance amounts for different categories of tenants and landlords and type of rental unit. There are numerous examples of local ordinances that do this.

6. **Consider expanding the coverage of the just cause ordinance.** The city's just cause eviction ordinance can be more protective than the TPA, for example by expanding coverage to apartments that are newer than 15 years old, to condominiums and/or single family residences, etc. The City of Los Angeles has adopted a just cause eviction ordinance that covers all residential real property that is not already protected by the just cause eviction protections contained in the city's rent stabilization ordinance; the eviction protections kick in after 6 months of occupancy (versus 12 months under the TPA and the South Pasadena just cause eviction ordinance).

Thank you for your consideration,

Ed Elsner
[redacted]

From: Rachael Faught
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment for March 5th, 2025 re:
Date: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:55:29 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a proud member of the South Pasadena Tenants Union, I sat quaking with rage over the manipulation at the February 19th meeting, particularly when mayor Braun leapt at any statistic based excuse to shut down talks of Rent Stabilization Ordinance. Here are the real facts:

Per the California Department of Housing and Community Development: "Since 1969, California has required that all local governments (cities and counties) adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community, **at all income levels**." Not only has South Pasadena spectacularly failed to comply with State Law, they have gone out of their way to remain dismissive, even hostile, towards the 53% of South Pasadena residents who rent.

All landlords are business owners and must be held accountable as such. For all of its grandstanding about its "small town charm" (a phrase with well documented history in sundown towns), South Pasadena has permitted more than half of their residents to fall prey to predatory and/or negligent landlords.

Furthermore, there is no such thing as "naturally occurring affordable housing." The *only* way to achieve affordable housing is through a Rent Stabilization Ordinance! Without one, we will lose so many families in our highly regarded school district. Cities which South Pasadena can learn and replicate from include Pasadena, Burbank, and Culver City.

Although, what should we expect from a mayor whose investments include (among other corporate criminals) a known pyramid scheme (HERBALIFE); well-documented modern slavery and child labor violations (NESTLE); and UNITED HEALTHCARE - need I say more? Let us not forget Councilmember Primuth, whose law firm defends small landlords and whose investments include luxury home construction (TOLL BROTHERS INC) (DR HORTON). I believe this is referred to as a conflict of interest?

In conclusion, let it be known that The Council has only thrown oil onto an already well stoked fire. Your everloving noisy constituents have no intention of backing down until *every* South Pasadena resident is protected.
Rachael Faught
Registered Voter
South Pasadena Resident since 1997
Graduate of South Pasadena High School class of 2001

From: Casey Dukes
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: General Public Comment for 3/5 Meeting
Date: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:59:53 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a South Pasadena resident, renter, and SPUSD parent, I was appalled at the last City Council meeting that the Council voted 3-1 to not consider a rent stabilization ordinance. The study by HR&A was only halfway complete, and there was no reason to bring the RSO up to a vote so early on in the process. The fact that one Councilmember was absent and not able to participate in discussion puts an additional bad taste in my mouth.

There are well over a thousand households that are rent-burdened in South Pasadena (a conservative estimate since we do not have up-to-date numbers). Many of these households are SPUSD families who are struggling to budget all the expenses of raising a family with high annual rent increases that do not keep pace with wage increases. My own household has seen $400/month increase at our apartment since we moved in and as a result, we cannot be as generous with school and SPEF fundraising or participate in extracurriculars that would benefit my children.

Hearing Mayor Braun do the calculations in her head of how many households are rent burdened ("only 47%!") was frankly disgusting. How callous can you be to brush human beings off so easily?

I would like to point out that all members of the City Council are homeowners and many either own rental properties themselves, own stock in real estate/development companies, have received financial donations from landlords, and are close friends with people who financially benefit from South Pasadena not having rent stabilization. The corruption is apparent to anyone paying attention, and perhaps that is why the City has not conducted community outreach on rent stabilization.

Do better.

Casey Dukes