

**CORRESPONDENCE
FROM
JUNE 14, 2021
CITY COUNCIL
MEETING**

June 10, 2021

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
City of Pasadena, California
Via email

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

As former chair of the Pasadena Center Operating Company (PCOC) and a member of the board for 6.5 years, I am pleased to provide a letter in support of the budget submitted by the PCOC. The PCOC is contracted to operate a City owned facility which it does in not only a self-sustaining manner but manages to cover most costs of maintenance and capital improvement projects from its own revenue over cost of operation. Nationally, the PCOC is one of the few convention centers that are profitable-most all others are loss leaders for their cities. Also, as a reminder regarding the history of the development of the convention and conference, the PCOC was never expected to also fund the major expansion project out of operating revenues. It is important to recognize that the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) was originally planned to be the mechanism for funding the expansion from the very beginning.

Following are a few bullet points as reminders of how the PCOC expansion was funded and the history of the TOT:

- In 2005-2006, the City Council approved the Pasadena Convention Center expansion with the full knowledge that the new convention center would be paid for through TOT. All of the proformas presented showed the new Center would not pay for itself as no convention centers around the country pay for themselves. As a matter of fact, only a handful cover "operating costs," much less debt service. Convention centers provide significant economic impact to the community where they are located.
- In 2006, the City Council approved the construction of the new Pasadena Convention Center with the understanding that TOT would be the main funding source for the \$161 million project. The PCOC is proud the project came in under budget and opened six weeks in advance. The construction of convention centers around the country are funded by TOT and not operating revenue. Currently, the City of Sacramento is expanding the Center and Theater, funded by TOT at \$23-27 million a year.
- To add an earlier historical context, in 1983, the City of Pasadena retained Economics Research Associates (ERA) to prepare a management analysis of the Pasadena Center. The need for this effort arose primarily from increasing demands on the City's General Fund revenues in the wake of Proposition 13 at a time when the City's subsidy of Pasadena Center operations had continued to grow. ERA focused much of its funding solution on the City's Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT). ERA also measured the performance of the

Pasadena Center against like-sized centers elsewhere in the state. Stacked up against Sacramento, San Jose, Monterey, Fresno and San Diego. Pasadena's operating deficit (a comparison of expenses to earned revenue) was \$347,000 in 1982, compared to a \$2.7 million deficit in Sacramento that year and a \$600,000 deficit in Fresno. More recently, San Jose Convention Center lost over \$4m in operating revenue in 2019. ERA recommended the City should commit 60 percent of its TOT revenues to the Operating Company, thus creating an incentive system for The Pasadena Center and stabilizing its funding sources. The entire Pasadena City Board of Directors (as it was named at that time) approved a 60 percent set aside of TOT in a vote on June 12, 1984 and unanimously reaffirmed during a reconsideration vote in November 1984.

- In May 2016, Interim City Manager Steve Mermell amended the current Operating Agreement No. 12,380-2 between the PCOC and the City of Pasadena, thus capping the PCOC share of TOT to cover the debt service on the 2006A and 2008A bonds for the expansion of the Center plus \$500,000 for CIP needs.

As former chair, I am happy to report that for the past 11 years prior to the pandemic, the Pasadena Convention Center has surpassed all expectations in terms of events, revenues and expenses. With the addition of the PCOC-managed Ice Skating Center PCOC has contributed \$1.8 million annually to CIP needs.

As the City Council discusses the budget proposal from the PCOC, I hope this clarifies the situation regarding the TOT. I am eager for the public to be aware of the benefits of the PCOC. It is an asset to the City and should be valued as such and recognized for its self-sustaining operations.

Sincerely,



Dianne Philibosian, Ph.D.
Professor Emerita, Department of Recreation and Tourism Management
California State University, Northridge

436 South Arroyo Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91105
Cell: 818-800-6774

Martinez, Ruben

From: KristinOckershauser
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 12:35 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Pasadena Police Department Budget

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Pasadena City Council
Pasadena,CA

Dear Council Members,

As numerous residents have said, PPD's budget at \$92 million recommended for 2022 is bloated with responsibilities police are not equipped to carry out successfully.

Among those responsibilities is keeping neighborhoods safe from violent crime which has been on the rise. Countless times PPD has called for help from communities in securing information on shootings as earlier this year at Villa Parke.

There is ample evidence from Los Angeles and throughout the country, that programs using former gang members and other impacted neighborhood members, trained in public health mode of intervention, have more success than hard charging cops in reducing violent neighborhood crime.

Crime prevention is not a career opportunity for unionized law enforcement to accumulate overtime pay. It's a responsibility for elected officials to find and fund proven success.

Both the Police Department and the City Council are failing at violent crime prevention in Pasadena. It's way over time for new, proven models of success to be adequately funded outside Pasadena's Police Department.

Sincerely,

Kris Ockershauser
CICOPP
Pasadena

06/14/2021
Item 18

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Pasadena's Zero Waste Plan, Accessories Upon Request and an Invitation to organize City Clean-Ups together
Attachments: CC_01122021_Report_8a (1).pdf

From: cheryl auger

Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>

Cc: Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Bawa, Gurcharan <gbawa@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Suzuki, Takako <tsuzuki@cityofpasadena.net>; ANITA GHAZARIAN <anighz@gmail.com>; Ellen Finkelppearl <efinkelp@scrippscollege.edu>; Beth Elder <bethlyonselder@yahoo.com>; Sylvia Holmes <sylvia_holmes@me.com>; Nancy Youngblut <blauhorse@gmail.com>; Wesley Reutimann <wesleyreutimann@gmail.com>; Kora McNaughton <koramcn@gmail.com>; Greg Apodaca <apodacac2.0@gmail.com>; odell@usc.edu; Ozzy Simpson <osimpson2020@sequoyahschool.org>; Flores, Valerie <vflores@cityofpasadena.net>; Morey Wolfson <moreywolfson@aol.com>; William Kelly <wjkelly7@gmail.com>; Christine Lenches-Hinkel <clhinkel@301organics.com>; Silva, Gabriel <gsilva@cityofpasadena.net>; Ara <amaloyan@cityofpasadena.net>; porras@cityofpasadena.net; siler.iesha@gmail.com; Thyret, Pam <pthyret@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>; bansuprefill@gmail.com; brigham@dtlarising.com; alicia.hail.lipsky@gmail.com
Subject: Pasadena's Zero Waste Plan, Accessories Upon Request and an Invitation to organize City Clean-Ups together

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Dear Mayor and Vice Mayor,

I would like to follow up on the Accessories Upon Request Ordinance which we hoped would be finalized in April and Public Works' progress on the Zero Waste Plan which I thought would be presented in February. At this point I don't believe what has been done in the past is important, with a near 50% increase in waste generation and less than 5% of materials actually being recyclable, what we are going to do moving forward is more important. We should immediately follow Glendale's ordinance to eliminate all SUPs in City operations and for City sponsored/permitted events (see attached) and tax items that are not recyclable to help cover disposal or recycling infrastructure start-up costs and assess the ZWP to see how it should be improved to make more meaningful progress.

Secondly, many individuals have expressed interest in having my store organize neighborhood cleanups around the same time I saw that Council member Nithya Ramen organized a clean-up in her district, CD-4. It would be nice if each Council District would support/ co-sponsor a clean-up on a specific day so we can conduct a city-wide clean up. We could also do brand assessments of the waste collected and assess the waste that is polluting Pasadena as well as compare the totals by district. Let me know if there is an interest in organizing and supporting this.

Mark, please distribute to the many Council members and council support staff I have missed. If you can send me an updated contact list I will use it in the future. Thank you!

Thanks,
Cheryl Auger

--

Cheryl Auger
www.bansuprefill.com



**CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

AGENDA ITEM

Report: Polystyrene and Single-Use Plastic Ban

1. Motion providing direction to staff to prepare an ordinance prohibiting the use of polystyrene and single-use plastic products in all City facilities, City-managed concessions, City-sponsored events, and City-permitted events that serve prepared food.

COUNCIL ACTION

Item Type: Action Item

Approved for January 12, 2021 **calendar**

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Submitted by:

Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., Interim City Manager

Prepared by:

David Jones, Sustainability Officer

Reviewed by:

Michele Flynn, Director of Finance

Michael J. Garcia, City Attorney

Approved by:

Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., Interim City Manager

RECOMMENDATION

It is respectfully recommended that the City Council approve a motion to provide direction to staff to prepare an ordinance prohibiting the use of polystyrene and single-use plastic products in all City facilities.

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

The City of Glendale strives to be a leader in protecting the environment through sustainable practices. In August 2020, City Council directed staff to research the feasibility of a polystyrene and single-use plastic ban within City facilities. City Council had also previously directed staff to research a single use plastic ban City wide. Plastic pollution, including polystyrene and single-use plastics, has raised environmental and health concerns related to water pollution, the welfare of marine life, human health, and aesthetics. This regulation will reduce single-use waste; reduce greenhouse gas emissions; reduce the distribution of disposable single-use plastic; reduce polystyrene use and litter in the City; keep plastic waste from landfills; and reduce litter threats to natural ecosystems and ocean wildlife to protect the health of the Glendale community and promote environmentally sustainable practices in the City.

Single-Use Plastics

Single-use plastics are not just a problem in Glendale but across the globe. Locally, single-use plastics are a major source of litter and may contaminate recycling programs as confusion abounds around which forms of plastics are acceptable to discard in recycling bins. Through urban runoff channels, plastic waste in the City of Glendale accrues in local marine environments, which directly threatens marine life and their natural habitats. These plastic products take several hundred years to decompose. This fact, coupled with the increased usage of disposable plastic products over the years, means ocean pollution is growing at an alarming rate. The World Economic Forum predicts that by 2050 there will be more plastic in the ocean than fish by weight.

Straws, stirrers, take-out containers, and lids are among the top 10 most common items found on the beach, according to the 2018 Ocean Conservancy. Additionally, Heal the Bay's Marine Debris database shows the number of straws collected during their beach cleanups has increased over 43 percent since 2014. These small items are not only ending up in surrounding marine environments, but also in the streets, in storm drains, on the beach, and in the ocean, which is causing aesthetic and litter problems in the City.

Bioplastics

Some disposable food service ware is made with plant-based polymers known as bioplastics. Unlike petroleum-based plastics, bioplastics are made from renewable resources such as corn, sugar, and soy protein and are often labeled "compostable." Bioplastics are not recyclable like petroleum-based plastics; however, they are capable of decomposing in some industrial compost facilities (but not in the natural environment.) There is currently no facility in the Southern California region that can compost them.

Because bioplastics look and feel very similar to petroleum-based plastics, it can be difficult for consumers and sorters to distinguish them from recyclable plastics. However, because they are not recyclable like petroleum-based plastics, bioplastics are viewed as contaminants by recycling processors. Bioplastics that end up in recycling and composting bins are separated and sent to landfills.

Marine Degradable Ware



















Marine-degradable disposal food service ware refers to products designed to biodegrade under the marine environmental conditions of aerobic marine waters or anaerobic marine sediments. This specification excludes products predominantly made with either petroleum-based or biologically based plastics. Some examples of marine-degradable material include, but are not limited to, paper, fiber, bagasse (fibrous matter that remains after sugarcane or sorghum stalks are processed), wheat straw, seaweed, wood, and food (pasta and licorice straws). Disposable food service ware made from this type of material can be disposed of in organics bins in City facilities and composted whether or not food residue is present. By requiring marine-degradable disposal food service ware, the City would create a more uniform stream of material that could be repurposed into compost, would reduce contamination of the recycled waste stream, and would reduce the amount of foodservice ware going to the landfill.

Recycling of Plastics

The following information was gathered from a report conducted by the UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation titled, "Plastic Waste in Los Angeles County."

Recycling of single-use plastics, especially food service ware plastic, is difficult. One of the main reasons why recycling can be burdensome is the Resin Identification Codes. These codes are imprinted on plastic products to indicate the type of materials they are composed of. This code system helps waste collectors and facilities identify if they can effectively process the recovered materials. The problem is that most, if not all recycling facilities, cannot process all plastic waste. Code #5 plastics (yogurt cups, ice cream containers) can only be processed effectively in facilities with certain types of equipment, and Codes #3 (cosmetic packaging, device packaging), #4 (trash bags, newspaper), #6 (Styrofoam), and #7 (mixed plastics) are generally landfilled. Single-use plastic food service ware, among other items, is especially challenging for Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF's) to process and recover for recycling because of contamination. Due to these challenges, single-use plastic food service ware is generally not recycled in Los Angeles County. The limitations of recycling make it insufficient to be the sole means of addressing the impacts of plastic production and waste.

The following table represent current disposal options for food service ware at the City of Glendale recycling center.

	Recycle Bin	Green Waste/Organics	Landfill Bin
Plastics resin codes 1 & 2 large & clean			
Plastic resin codes #3 - #5 large & clean or dirty (bowls, trays, cups and plates)			
Plastics resin codes #1- #5 small			
Plastic resin code # 6 polystyrene			
Plastic resin code # 7 bioplastics			
Marine degradable			

The recycling of small items such as straws, utensils, lids, stirrers, and lid plugs are also not economically viable at the municipal level. Items that are sent to the recycling facility are sorted on a conveyor belt and baled before being shipped to buyers. Small, lightweight items easily fall off the conveyor belt or become stuck in confined spaces within the equipment. The operational and labor costs of bundling these items exceed the value of

the items and therefore they are typically sent to the landfill rather than recycled. Additionally, the recycling market has recently experienced a huge disruption. China, traditionally the largest importer of U.S. recyclable material, began enforcing stricter requirements for importing solid waste. Since January 1, 2018, China has prohibited 24 types of solid waste materials, including household waste plastics such as food service ware. This has significantly impacted the recycling industry in the U.S., making recycling of many waste streams, including plastics and mixed paper, uneconomical.

Policy Recommendation

In an effort to take a first step in addressing the global environmental impacts related to disposable products, staff recommends the City Council consider adoption of an ordinance which requires that all disposable food service ware utilized within City facilities including; City-managed concessions, City-sponsored events, and City-permitted events that serve prepared food must be marine-degradable to reduce or eliminate the amount of disposable food service ware sent to the landfill and the amount of plastic pollution in the ocean. Disposable food service ware made from bioplastics would also be prohibited. It is recommended that beverage cups and lids be excluded from the definition of disposable food service ware because a suitable marine-degradable alternative does not exist at this time. However, beverage cups and lids may not be made of polystyrene.

What Other Cities Have Done

Currently, over 100 municipalities within the State of California have either restricted or prohibited the use of polystyrene and single-use plastics within their communities at large. Of these cities, more than 28 municipalities also prohibited the distribution of polystyrene straws, utensils, and lids at food establishments within their ordinances. Some examples include the following:

In 2016, the City of Pasadena approved a Styrofoam ban that prohibited the distribution of Styrofoam food containers within City limits. The City of Culver City adopted an ordinance to regulate the sale and distribution of polystyrene disposable food service ware in 2017. This ordinance also prohibits the distribution and sale of polystyrene straws, utensils, and lids, as well as a “Cutlery Upon Request” policy. In 2018, the City of Santa Monica adopted a revision to their existing ordinance to prohibit the distribution of non-marine degradable disposable food ware. In 2018, the City of Long Beach approved a Styrofoam ban that prohibited the distribution of Styrofoam food containers within City limits. In 2019, Burbank officials took the first steps to free the City of polystyrene and other single-use plastic materials. They plan to hire a consultant to develop the ban. At this time, they do not prohibit the use of polystyrene and single-use plastic items.

Other cities have recently taken additional measures to reduce the environmental impact of plastic straws and utensils. In 2017, both the City of Davis and the City of San Luis Obispo adopted a “Straw Upon Request” ordinance impacting only dine-in customers. In 2018, the City of Malibu adopted an ordinance to prohibit the sale and distribution of plastic straws, utensils, and stirrers within its City limits.

Next Steps

While this staff report focuses primarily on the prohibition of polystyrene and single-use plastic products in all City facilities, City-managed concessions, City-sponsored events, and City-permitted events that serve prepared food, it is recommended that staff provide alternative options for the effective date of the ordinance based on the current economic climate due to COVID-19, if still relevant. Staff will also provide options for phased-in programs with City Facilities being the first to adhere to the ordinance proposed by City Council. If food or beverage providers are contractually obligated to purchase polystyrene food service ware, they will be exempt from the provisions of this section for a period of six months following the operative date.

Staff recommend returning to City Council with an additional report on prohibition of single use plastics within Glendale's City limits once the COVID-19 pandemic is under control and food and beverage providers are able to return to more customary service operations. Such an expansion of an ordinance would extend to food and beverage providers within Glendale's City limits by prohibiting the distribution of non-marine degradable food service ware including plates, bowls, trays, containers, straws, utensils, stirrers, and lid plugs. The ordinance could further require that all marine-degradable disposable straws and utensils be provided to customers only upon request

Staff will undertake an extensive outreach and information campaign directed at the affected food and beverage providers. The outreach program will focus on determining the impact barriers to compliance including cost, availability of alternatives, exemptions, phased in start dates, and determine assistance needs so food and beverage providers may successfully comply with any proposed ordinance.

Food and beverage providers include but are not limited to: (1) a grocery store, supermarket, restaurant, drive-thru, cafe, coffee shop, snack shop, public food market, farmers market, convenience store, or similar fixed place where prepared food is available for sale on the premises or for takeaway consumption, and (2) any mobile store, food vendor, caterer, food truck, vending machine or similar mobile outlet and individuals serving prepared food in Glendale as part of their services.

FISCAL IMPACT

For City facilities, City managed concessions, City-sponsored events, and City-permitted events that will have to purchase alternatives to polystyrene and single-use plastic food service items, currently the purchase of these items is not tracked centrally, it is an assumption there will be a minimal cost adjustment based on the volume of product purchased. Furthermore, straws and utensils will only be provided upon request.

Table below outlines the cost of plastic vs. environmentally preferable replacements.

Item	Case of	Price	Per item cost	% (+/-)
Clamshells				
Natural Fiber Clamshell	300	\$ 89.72	\$ 0.30	30%
Bagasse Clamshell	50	\$ 12.49	\$ 0.25	9%
Styrofoam Clamshell	150	\$ 34.34	\$ 0.23	
Polystyrene Clamshell	125	\$ 33.03	\$ 0.26	13%
Utensils				
Birch Wood	1000	\$ 37.99	\$ 0.04	0%
Bamboo Utensils	1000	\$ 76.98	\$ 0.08	100%
Polystyrene utensils	1000	\$ 35.99	\$ 0.04	
Straws				
Pasta Straws	600	\$ 22.40	\$ 0.04	1233%
Paper Straws	4000	\$ 105.98	\$ 0.03	900%
Bagasse Straws	200	\$ 16.99	\$ 0.08	2566%
Plastic Unwrapped	5000	\$ 12.99	\$ 0.003	
Plastic Wrapped	12000	\$ 34.99	\$ 0.003	
Baseline cost				
Green comparison cost				

ALTERNATIVES

The City Council has the following alternatives to consider with respect to this agenda item:

1. The City Council can provide direction to prepare an ordinance which prohibits the use of polystyrene and single-use plastic products in all City facilities, City-managed concessions, City-sponsored events, and City-permitted events that serve prepared food.
2. The City Council can provide direction to prepare an ordinance which prohibits the use of polystyrene and single-use plastic products in all City facilities, City-managed concessions, City-sponsored events, and City-permitted events that serve prepared food, and direct staff to bring back a staff report that considers prohibiting food and beverage providers within Glendale's City limits from distributing non-marine degradable food service ware.
3. The City Council may consider any other alternative not presented by staff.

CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE

N/A

EXHIBITS

1. City of Santa Monica Ordinance
2. City of Hermosa Beach SUP Ban/Alternatives Brochure
3. UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation Report- "Plastic Waste in Los Angeles County"
4. Definitions

Martinez, Ruben

From:
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 10:38 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Gordo, Victor; City_Council
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT Agenda 6/14/2021 Pasadena City Council Meeting (Agenda Items # 6, #7 and #18). To: Mayor Victor Gordo and Pasadena City Council Members Thank You Very Much! Ms. Debra Ann Francis

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

June 14, 2021

City Of Pasadena
Pasadena City Council Meeting June 14, 2021
Pasadena City Hall

Re: Public Comment, Agenda Items #6, #7, and # 18

Dear Honorable Mayor Victor Gordo and Pasadena City Council Members:

Greetings:

My name is Debra Ann Francis and I am the 1st Vice President and Life-Time Member of the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) Altadena Branch. I am a Lifetime Member of the NAACP Pasadena Branch. I am an active Member of the League of Woman Voter's - Pasadena. And I am a Certified Member of the "Certified Emergency Response Team, CERT TEAM#33 for the Pasadena Fire Department Station #33 and LASD (Los Angeles Sheriff's Department - Altadena Station).

Today, I am speaking, as a Member of Pasadena Church with Pastors Kerwin and Madelyn Manning. I am deeply concerned and troubled by the City's proposal to continue **overfunding** the Pasadena Police Department resulting in severe underfunding of other necessary and imperative departments. The proposed budget, for Fiscal Year 2022 Operating Budget does the opposite of that and must be **rejected**.

My recommendations are to **'REFUND THE COMMUNITY'** and to **PLEASE decrease funding** to the Pasadena Police Department, at least

by the \$2.3 Million it reportedly saved from its operating budget last year, and shift these funds to **An Advance Peace - model program, a CAHOOTS - model program in the** city of Pasadena. This program in Pasadena will enable trained mental health professionals to assist community members in non-life-threatening crises instead of the Pasadena Police Department. Also, I want to live and worship in a community that **prioritizes funding in the youth outreach non-profit** programs in Pasadena that will **empower our youth** programs such as, The Pasadena Wolves Pop Warner Football and Cheer; Pasadena Central Little League; The Boys & Girls Club of Pasadena; Purpose Youth Sports - Pasadena; LL Film & Entertainment Youth Understudy Programs; Foster Youth Programs - EOP&S - Pasadena City College; Youth Employment and Internships/ Pasadena Chamber of Commerce; Day-One - non profit - Pasadena; Shepherd's Door Domestic Violence Resource Center - Pasadena; Friends In Deed Non-Profit Organization; and Pasadena Education Foundation...just to name a few.

Moreover, **funds should be allocated to affordable housing assistance and ending homelessness programs/non profit including** Making Housing Happen and Community Happen - Pasadena; Affordable Housing Services - Pasadena; Pasadena Housing Department; Housing - Union Station Homeless Services - Pasadena and Heritage Housing Partner - Pasadena and The -Pasadena Adult Rehabilitation Center - The Salvation Army. Also, additional funds are essential for programs to assist with elder care, mental health and public health. These above Pasadena community assistance programs, may receive outside funding however the funds are inadequate and many programs have had to close lately. A \$10,000.00 community "Donations" from asset forfeitures and "funding" of a second PORT team, is simply not enough. **We demand more equitable community funding now.**

I am in agreement and concur with you Mayor Gordo, in your statements, "As Mayor, I will put the people of Pasadena first. I will work to bring us together as residents of Pasadena to ensure we are working together address issues throughout Pasadena". And "The most important responsibility for me as an elected official is the willingness to listen to all vantage points, to be willing to stand before anyone who has a concern, who wants to talk...I have a responsibility to be prepared to listen to everyone". In the "Spirit of Diversity Equity and Inclusion -DEI", please acknowledge that in the city of Pasadena of 144,000 residents a large percentage of residents, English is their second language (ESL). **Therefore, my recommendation to the Pasadena City Council is to please CONTINUE with Granting 3 Minutes of Public Comment Time During Council Members. And, if possible in continuing the "Virtual - Zoom City Council Meeting" to maintain open dialogue and transparency.**

The City has the opportunity to use a significant portion of the June 2021 allocation of \$26 million of the expected \$52,625,975 in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to fulfill part of the ARPA's goal of **"rebuilding a stronger, more equitable economy"**.

Instead, Staff recommendations prioritize funding Tourism Recovery and General Fund losses over critical programs and Pasadena's most vulnerable and marginalized residents.

Equitably using ARPA funds in Pasadena is **the ultimate way to bring about the positive change community members need and continue to demand.**

City Council must reject Staff recommendations, aside from vital Public Health Department expenditures, prioritize community equity, and grant robust opportunities for community members to provide input on how ARPA funds are spent.

I hope and pray that you, our Honorable Elected Mayor Victor Gordo and the Honorable Elected Officials our Pasadena City Council Members, **"Legacy" for the 2022 Fiscal Year Budget for the City of Pasadena, will be remembered as "UNITY To RE-FUND the CommUNITY!"**

Thanking you in advance for your valuable time and your considerations in the above recommendations.

God Bless Everyone of you AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE!

Best Regards,

**Sr. Debra Ann Francis
Member**

**Pasadena Church
...a Church with NO LIMITS!!!**

Pastors Kerwin and Madelyn Manning

Pasadena, California 91104