CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2026, AT 7:00 PM

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Additional Documents to the August 19, 2026 City Council Meetings. 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 AUGUST 19, 2026, CITY COUNCIL MEETING

- Memo for Item No. 1
- Memo for Item No. 15
- Public Comment_Tucker Nelson_ Item No. 1
- Public Comment_Josh Betta_ Item No. 1
- Public Comment_Josh Albrektson_ Item No. 11
- Public Comment_Jennifer Kelly_ Item No. 15
- Public Comment_Casey Dukes_ Item No. 15
- Public Comment_MK Campbell_ Item No. 15
- Public Comment_Richard Hawkins_ Item No. 15

City of South Pasadena
Public Works

Memo

Date: August 17, 2026

To: The Honorable City Council

Via: Todd Hileman, City Manager

From: Julian Lee, Director of Public Works
Michael Vartanians, City Engineer
Bassam AL-Beitawi, Transportation Manager

Subject: August 19, 2026 City Council Study Session Meeting Item No. 1 – Review, Discuss and Provide Input on a Draft Request for Proposals for the Preparation of a City Mobility Plan and Citywide Safety Action Plan

This memorandum is intended to replace the "Commission Review and Recommendation" section of the agenda report posted on August 13, 2026. The Public Works Infrastructure Commission (PWIC) reviewed the item at its meeting on the evening of August 12, 2026. Due to the timing of the meeting and subsequent posting of the City Council agenda report, staff required additional time to compile and summarize the Commission's discussion and feedback. The updated Commission Review and Recommendation section below reflects the comments and input received from the PWIC.

Commission Review and Recommendation

At its August 12, 2026 meeting, the Public Works Infrastructure Commission (PWIC) reviewed the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) and provided feedback regarding the proposed scope of work. The Commission was generally supportive of the City's approach but expressed concern regarding the breadth of the proposed scope relative to the available $400,000 budget. Commissioners recommended that the RFP more clearly define the City's priorities, anticipated level of effort, and expected deliverables to ensure that the scope is achievable and attracts qualified consultant teams.

The Commission also emphasized that the Mobility Plan should be implementation-focused and build upon previous City planning efforts rather than duplicate work already completed. Commissioners specifically discussed incorporating prior studies and concepts, including the Mission Street Slow Streets project and previous Monterey Road planning efforts, and developing planning-level concepts, cost estimates, and project priorities that can support future grant applications and implementation. Additional feedback included clarifying the role of the proposed community steering committee; considering parking, right-of-way, pavement and sidewalk conditions, and other implementation constraints; coordinating recommendations with future street resurfacing and capital improvement projects; and more clearly defining the scope of the proposed SB 79, parking, policy, funding, and bicycle and pedestrian network analyses.

No other changes were made to this report.

City of South Pasadena
City Manager's Office

Memo

Date: August 18, 2026

To: The Honorable City Council

Via: Todd Hileman, City Manager

From: Davit Ghazaryan, Management Analyst

Subject: August 19, 2026, City Council Meeting Item No. 15:

A summary of the Public Safety Commission's recommendation

This memorandum is intended to replace the "Commission Review and Recommendation" section of the agenda report posted on August 13, 2026.

The Public Safety Commission (PSC) was presented the South Pasadena Police Departments (SPPD) evaluation and recommendations in relation to its preferred Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) vendor during a special meeting that took place on the evening of August 13, 2026. Due to the timing of the meeting and subsequent posting of the City Council agenda report, staff required additional time to compile and summarize the Commission's discussion and feedback. The updated Commission Review and Recommendation section below reflects the comments and input received from the PSC.

Commission Review and Recommendation

At the August 13, 2026, special meeting the PSC reviewed the staff report and the attached quotes in relation to ALPR vendor evaluation and analysis that the SPPD prepared for the City Council. Commissioners inquired about the strengths and weaknesses of each vendor that were considered and specifically wanted to ensure the prospective system's compatibility with SPPD's technical capabilities as well as that of the neighboring Police Departments. The Commission unanimously supported and approved of the Departments suggested course of action in relation to their preferred ALPR vendor and recommended it for the City Councils approval.

No other changes were made to this report.

From: Tucker Nelson
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment Aug 18 Special Session
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 9:21:24 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.

Dear All,

This is a public comment for the August 18 city council special session, agenda item 1.

I appreciate the staff who wrote the RFP. It is clearly written. It is not boilerplate and is tailored to South Pasadena.

I strongly urge the council to pass the agenda item and have the RFP move forward. Citywide mobility and safety plans are much needed. We need to plan in a coherent manner across the entire city, during the next one to ten years and beyond, taking into account both the changes the residents want and changes made by outside forces.

Currently we have a vague vision that is being implemented in a piecemeal fashion often dictated by outside grants and state laws.

In contrast, these combined plans will design transportation infrastructure that will create the city that the residents want and mesh individual projects toward the end goal.

In addition, these plans are needed now, due to the increasing frustration of residents, the proposed residential density increases, and the swiftly changing hazards of urban environments. Note that evacuations were required for Altadena (wilderness fire), Boyle Heights (building fire), Garden Grove (high risk of explosion), and Hastings Ranch (gas leak, albeit a few years ago).

Also, micromobility will likely become more prevalent, and we are not prepared. Currently on our streets and sidewalks, there are bikes, e-bikes, children on child-size motorcycles, scooters, skateboards, tricycles, cargo bikes, a go-cart (I believe), and, when the new senior housing is built, rascals.

We need both an updated safety plan and an updated mobility plan.

On a different note, I have specific comments.

On page 10 of the agenda packet or page 4 of the RFP, to the first bullet point, add 'in-city shuttles' to the list of transportation options.

On the same page, to the fifth bullet point, do you want to mention that our city may get bus rapid transit stops, which may also increase density per SB 79?

On the same page, to the last bullet point, add 'Metro bus stops and city hall' to the list of locations.

On page 14 of the agenda packet or page 8 of the RFP, to the third bullet point from the top, add 'delivery vehicle parking - both residential and commercial' to the list of transportation improvements.

Sincerely,

Tucker Nelson

From:	Josh Betta
To:	City Council Public Comment; JANET BRAUN; Josh Betta; Jon Primuth; Peter Giulioni Jr. - Gmail; Michael Cacciotti; Sheila Rossi; Omari Ferguson
Subject:	Study Session Item 1
Date:	Tuesday, August 18, 2026 6:39:35 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.

With abundant respect, I ask Councilmember Cacciotti to resist campaign speeches during the discussion.

Josh Betta
[redacted]

From: Josh Albrektson
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Item 11 public comment
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 10:33:28 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.

It is pretty wild that on March 5th we budgeted $450k for this project. A year later it doubled in cost.

And this is a million dollar just to asses the road, not actually doing the work.

This should not be a consent item. This is something that should actually be fully explained.

--
Josh Albrektson MD
Neuroradiologist by night
Crime fighter by day

From:	Jennifer Kelly
To:	City Council Public Comment
Subject:	Public Comment for August 19, 2026 City Council Meeting – Agenda Item: ALPR/Flock Camera Transition Updates
Date:	Wednesday, August 19, 2026 2:43:09 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.

Subject: Public Comment for August 19, 2026 City Council Meeting – Agenda Item: ALPR/Flock Camera Transition Updates

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

My name is Jennifer Kelly and I am a homeowner and resident of South Pasadena. I am writing to strongly urge the City Council to halt its current search for alternative automated license plate reader (ALPR) vendors.

When this council voted 4–1 in March to terminate the city's contracts with Flock Safety, it sent a powerful message that our community prioritizes data privacy, civil liberties, and the protection of vulnerable groups over blanket mass surveillance. However, replacing Flock with another ALPR company simply replaces one surveillance network with another. Every automated tracking system inherently carries the risk of data leaks, third-party misuse, and the erosion of public trust.

Instead of looking for technological workarounds, South Pasadena has a rare opportunity to be a true pioneer in the region. By completely decommissioning these tracking systems and refusing to invite new surveillance vendors into our city, we can lead the fight against an encroaching surveillance society.

Our safety should be built on community investment, transparent local policing, and robust neighborhood infrastructure, not on tracking the movements of every driver who enters our borders.

I urge you to permanently end the city's ALPR program and dedicate our municipal resources to privacy-respecting community safety initiatives and infrastructure programs. Repave our streets. Install speed bumps to protect kids playing. Strengthen South Pasadena's disaster preparedness and emergency plans. Train and retrain our police on de-escalation techniques to avoid violent encounters.

There are plenty of ways to invest in our amazing town's safety AND protect civil liberties. I am hoping you'll consider them.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kelly

From: Casey Dukes
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment for Agenda Item #15
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 11:16:32 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.

Dear Council,

I applaud your past action on voting not to renew one of our two Flock Safety contracts. You really listened to the concerns of residents and put a lot of thought into what was best for our City and the vendors we choose.

Upon reading the report prepared by SPPD on replacement ALPR vendors (once we completely sever our relationship with Flock Safety), I am not convinced that any of the vendors listed have enough restrictions for data privacy, retention, and sharing. Of the three options, SoundThinking's PlateRanger meets requirements laid out in the March meeting the best, but even still, I cannot forget the commenter from that meeting who pointed out that data is never truly deleted.

Through discussions with neighbors and upon further reading, I am not convinced South Pasadena needs to be using an ALPR service at all. South Pasadena is such a small city with low crime that spending tens of thousands of dollars each year on surveillance seems overkill and unnecessary.

I urge you to reexamine the need for an ALPR system in our town. I believe the SPPD's budget would be better spent on officer training and public services for our unhoused neighbors.

Mass surveillance cameras do not make me feel safer, but in fact do quite the opposite. I don't want to worry about my car's movements being recorded when I'm going about my day. Proponents of mass surveillance will argue that people who are not doing anything illegal don't need to worry about being watched, but we have seen, year after year, that people in power can redefine what is legal.

Casey Dukes

From:	mk c
To:	City Council Public Comment
Subject:	Public Comment for August 19, 2026 City Council Meeting – Agenda Item: ALPR/Flock Camera Transition Updates
Date:	Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:54:32 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.

Subject: Public Comment for August 19, 2026 City Council Meeting – Agenda Item: ALPR/Flock Camera Transition Updates

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

My name is MK Campbell, and I am a homeowner and resident of South Pasadena. I am writing to strongly urge the City Council to halt its current search for alternative automated license plate reader (ALPR) vendors.

When this council voted 4–1 in March to terminate the city's contracts with Flock Safety, it sent a powerful message that our community prioritizes data privacy, civil liberties, and the protection of vulnerable groups over blanket mass surveillance. However, replacing Flock with another ALPR company simply replaces one surveillance network with another. Every automated tracking system inherently carries the risk of data leaks, third-party misuse, and the erosion of public trust.

Instead of looking for technological workarounds, South Pasadena has a rare opportunity to be a true pioneer in the region. By completely decommissioning these tracking systems and refusing to invite new surveillance vendors into our city, we can lead the fight against an encroaching surveillance society.

Our safety should be built on community investment, transparent local policing, and robust neighborhood infrastructure, not on tracking the movements of every driver who enters our borders.

I urge you to permanently end the city's ALPR program and dedicate our municipal resources to privacy-respecting community safety initiatives and infrastructure programs. Repave our streets. Install speed bumps to protect kids playing. Strengthen South Pasadena's disaster preparedness and emergency plans. Train and retrain our police on de-escalation techniques to avoid violent encounters.

There are plenty of ways to invest in our amazing town's safety AND protect civil liberties. I am hoping you'll consider them.

Sincerely,

MK Campbell

From: Richard Hawkins
To: City Council Public Comment
Subject: Comment for meeting on 8/19
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 4:26:42 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.

In March, the City Council chose not to renew a Flock Safety contract covering 14 license plate reader cameras because of concerns surrounding privacy, data sharing, and public trust. Five months later, Flock cameras are still visibly present throughout the city, while another contract covering additional cameras to my understanding has remained in effect.

My question is simple: Which Flock cameras are still actively collecting data today, which have actually been deactivated, and what is the City's specific timeline for removing the remaining cameras and ending its relationship with Flock Safety?

If the City has determined that this technology raises serious enough concerns to begin discontinuing it, residents deserve more than an announcement. We deserve a clear timetable, transparency about what is still operating, and accountability for completing what was started.

Richard Hawkins