

Martinez, Ruben

From: Carol Daley <
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2021 6:02 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse

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...](#)

Thanks for the additional funding for homeless services that you have allocated to the various groups in Pasadena. Our hats off to you!
God bless you!
Carol Daley, co-founder Foothills Kitchen

06/21/2021
Item 11

RECEIVED

2021 JUN 21 AM 8:33

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

SONJA K. BERNDT
Pasadena, CA 91107

June 19, 2021

Mayor Victor Gordo
Members of the Pasadena City Council
Pasadena, CA
(By email to correspondence@cityofpasadena.net)

Re: Agenda Item #11: The Recommended FY 2022 Operating Budget

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the City Council:

I. Introduction

Many others and I have submitted correspondence and live public comments at every budget meeting, urging you to re-allocate funds to help our most vulnerable and marginalized residents. I urge you not to simply rubber stamp the proposed operating budget, which allocates a massive portion of the General Fund to the Police Department **at the expense of our most vulnerable residents.**

II. The Gross Inequity in Departmental General Fund Allocations is Unconscionable

The Recommended FY 2022 Operating Budget shows the following funding from the General Fund: Police Department \$84,605,000; Housing Department: \$1,475,000; Public Health Department: \$0.00. Although the Housing and Public Health Departments receive grant funding from county, state, and/or federal governments, the undeniable fact is that **the non-local funding our Housing and Public Health Departments receive is far short of what our City actually needs to provide critical services to our most vulnerable residents.**

As of the January 2020 homeless count, we had over 500 unhoused persons, nearly 300 of which had no shelter at all. Experts have predicted that these numbers will rise due to the pandemic. While some of our unsheltered persons have obtained interim or permanent housing this past year, most did not. Further, how many more persons have fallen into homelessness this past year?

As for our Public Health Department, members of this Council have publicly agreed that our Public Health Department should get more money and expand its programs in order to improve the health of the community. According to Dr. Goh, the health department does not have enough money to pursue more ambitious solutions to problems like poverty and the health impacts that flow from it. The clear problem is that these Departments do not have sufficient staff or financial resources for programs that would end homelessness, achieve better health and mental health outcomes, and meet other critical community needs.

III. Possible Reallocations from the Police Department Budget to Address Critical Health, Mental Health, Housing and Other Community Needs

A. Possible Re-Allocations from Police Budget for Line Items that Lack Transparency and Remain Unexplained

As I have previously stated, there are a number of Police Department operating budget line items that lack transparency and leave many questions unanswered, including the following:

- The Police Department’s personnel costs (total) have risen over \$6 million from 2020 actual costs.
- The City’s portion for Police Department retirement benefits (SPERS) jumped from \$10,915,288 (2020 actual) to \$15,755,242 (FY 2022), **despite the fact there is no change in FTEs in the PPD from 2020 to 2022.**
- Personnel category 805000 (Benefits) rose from \$6,552,770 (2020 actual) to \$7,800,375 (FY 2022).
- Services and Supplies category 815600 (Insurance) soared from \$229,917 (2020 actual) to \$785,762 (FY 2022).
- “Other Contract Services” = \$3,055,641.
- “Internal Service Charges” = \$6,796,288 for “strategic services,” with no further explanation. Compare the Public Health Department’s “Internal Service Charges” of \$1,095,811 (“health administration”) and the Fire Department’s “Internal Service Charges” of \$3,117,205 (“fire operations”).

The following line item also raises serious questions: “New Years Day General Fund Events” (Statement of Appropriations category 106) notes a FY 2021 Revised total of \$1,584,000, nearly as much as 2020 (actual costs), even though there was no Rose Parade or Rose Bowl in FY 2021.

I have listened to the budget hearings, but have not heard any explanation of any of these items. **I urge you to scrutinize these line items, and the Police Department operating budget as a whole, and demand answers.**

B. Possible Re-Allocations of the \$2.3 Million in Police Operations “Savings”

The Police Department reported that it “saved” \$2.3 million in operations last year, which will be used for the remodel of its building and a mobile command center. **This money needs to be used for decent treatment of our unsheltered residents and to fund policing alternatives, outside of the Police Department, that counteract the disparate impact of policing on Black community members, not for remodeling a building.** Moreover, despite this purported savings last year, the recommended FY 2022 Police Department Operating Budget is almost the same as last year’s. **This makes no sense unless the Police Department plans to “save” more money in operations so it can pay for the remaining, currently unfunded, \$2 million in remodeling expenses in 2023 and 2024. How can the City Council, in good faith, allow this to happen?**

C. Possible Re-Allocations to Fund a CAHOOTS-Model Mobile Crisis Intervention Program

As other community members and I have explained, Crisis Assistance Helping Out On The Streets (CAHOOTS) is an innovative community-based public safety system that provides mental health first-response for crises involving mental illness, homelessness, and addiction. CAHOOTS has been found to be safe and cost effective. **In 2017, the Eugene, Oregon CAHOOTS teams answered 17% of the Eugene Police Department’s overall call volume.¹ The program costs about \$2.1 million annually and saves the city of Eugene an estimated \$8.5 million in public safety spending annually. (Ibid.)**

How many **unnecessary** police interactions and arrests could be avoided if Pasadena employed such a system? **(Also, consider the associated taxpayer-funded criminal justice system costs).** Funds can be re-allocated from the Police Department to the Public Health Department for a CAHOOTS program since it will be unnecessary to deploy police officers in non-life-threatening situations involving persons suffering from mental illness or a substance use disorder.

¹ ([https://whitebirdclinic.org/what-is-cahoots/.](https://whitebirdclinic.org/what-is-cahoots/))

I am grateful that Vice Mayor Wilson and Councilmember Madison have asked that CAHOOTS be agendized at a Public Safety Committee meeting. I urge the Committee to promptly agendize this issue and to hear from persons who have experience in a CAHOOTS program, such as Ben Adam Climer, a local consultant.

IV. The City Council Should Approve Funding for a Second PORT Unit

The Pasadena Outreach Response Team (PORT) provides field-based support and advocacy for people who are experiencing homelessness, living with chronic health conditions, and/or diagnosed with mental health and/or substance use disorders. I am familiar with the important role the PORT plays in assisting our residents experiencing homelessness. I strongly support the requested funding for a second PORT unit, **but through the Public Health Department, not the Police Department since this is public health program**. But the addition of a second PORT unit is not a reason to forego a CAHOOTS model crisis intervention program. In April 2021, PPD received **9,707** calls for service, including **4,684** 9-1-1 calls. It is unclear how many of these calls were non-life-threatening calls that should have been responded to by someone other than a uniformed police officer. But Mr. Mermell says, in his budget transmittal letter, that it is believed that thousands of calls for service annually might be redirected away from the Police Department “to PORT or some successor model.”

V. Conclusion

The staff report dated June 21, 2021, states that the recommended operating budget for FY 2022 “furthers the City’s mission to deliver exemplary municipal services responsive to our entire community.” On the contrary, it does not. The recommended budget **precludes** our City from protecting its most vulnerable residents and from instituting critical programs needed in our marginalized communities. Despite numerous public comments and correspondence urging the Council to adopt a smarter, fairer budget that really **is** responsive to the needs of our entire community, staff has ignored those pleas. So it is up to you, members of our City Council. Please do the right, fair and moral thing and insist on the re-allocations requested by community members. Please re-fund our community. Thank you.

Sincerely,

/s/

Sonja K. Berndt, Esq. (retired)

Cc: Local News Organizations

Martinez, Ruben

From: Kenichi Yoshida <l
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 8:28 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: June 21, 2021 City Council Meeting, Agenda Item 11

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...](#)

Hello,

My name is Kenichi Yoshida, a Japanese immigrant, higher education administrator in Pasadena and faith leader of this community. I live in District 4.

Mr. Gene Masuda, you are my Council Member, and Mr. Gordo, you are my Mayor. City Council Members, you represent our community as a whole. I am asking you to direct City Staff to answer the following important questions during the discussion of Agenda Item #11, **BEFORE VOTING** to approve the Recommended City Budget:

- 1) Why have the Pasadena Police Department's (PPD) **personnel costs** (total) **risen over \$6 million** from 2020 actual costs?
- 2) Why did PPD have a Revised total of **\$1,584,000** for "**New Years Day General Fund Events,**" nearly as much as 2020 (actual costs), **even though there was no Rose Parade or Rose Bowl in FY 2021?**
- 3) Does the Council intend to **overfund PPD** in FY 2022, the way it did in FY2021, so that PPD can use reported "savings" on controversial projects?
 - (Note: PPD reportedly saved \$2.3 million from its FY2021 Operating Budget, and the Council recently approved some of these funds for PPD's new Mobile Command Center.)
 - Instead, why not **reduce PPD's budget by the \$2.3 million they did not need or use for its operations in FY 2021 to fund vital community projects** for FY 2022?
- 4) Why did **Personnel category 805000 (Benefits)** rise by over a million dollars, from \$6,552,770 (2020 actual) to \$7,800,375 (FY 2022)?
- 5) Why did **Services and Supplies category 815600 (Insurance)** more than triple from \$229,917 (2020 actual) to \$785,762 (FY 2022)?
- 6) What **EXACTLY** is included in the **vague category, "Other Contract Services,"** which totals **\$3,055,641?**
- 7) What **EXACTLY** is included in the **vague category, "Internal Service Charges,"** which totals **\$6,796,288** for "**strategic services,**" with **no further explanation.**
 - Compare this to the **Public Health Department's** "Internal Service Charges" of \$1,095,811 ("health administration") and the **Fire Department's** "Internal Service Charges" of \$3,117,205 ("fire operations").

Many Council Members promised **Transparency** while campaigning. Voting on the budget without answering pertinent questions is *not* transparent. Residents have not been afforded the opportunity to seek answers to highly relevant questions during these Budget Hearings.

Today, I call on Council Member Gene Masuda, Mayor Victor Gordo, and allelected officials to provide answers to these pertinent questions **now**, BEFORE Voting on the Budget.

If Staff cannot answer the questions or if the answers provided are *not* in line with good stewardship over our community's funds, I request that you Reject the proposed budget. Until good stewardship over our City Budget funds can be proven, this budget must be rejected.

Thank you.

Martinez, Ruben

From: Margaret Starbuck <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 1:10 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment City Council Meeting 6/21/21 Agenda Item #11

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...](#)

My name is Margaret Starbuck. I live in District 5. Jessica Rivas you are my Council Member, and Mr. Gordo, you are my Mayor. I am asking you to direct City Staff to answer the following important questions during the discussion of Agenda Item #11, **BEFORE VOTING** to approve the Recommended City Budget:

- 1) Why has the City's portion for PPD Retirement Benefits (SPERS) jumped from \$10,915,288 (2020 actual) to \$15,755,242 (FY 2022), despite the fact that there is no change in Full Time Equivalent (also known as FTEs or work hours) in PPD from 2020 to 2022?
- 2) What **EXACTLY** is included in the *vague* category, "Other Contract Services," which totals \$3,055,641?
- 3) What **EXACTLY** is included in the *vague* category, "Internal Service Charges," which totals \$6,796,288 for "strategic services," with no further explanation.
- 4) Does the Council intend to overfund PPD in FY 2022, the way it did in FY2021, so that PPD can use reported "savings" on controversial projects? Instead, why not reduce PPD's budget by the \$2.3 million they did not need or use for its operations in FY 2021 to fund vital community projects for FY 2022? Our Pasadena community is in urgent need of investment in affordable housing, our public schools, and mental health services.

Many Council Members promised **Transparency** while campaigning. Voting on the budget without answering pertinent questions is *not* transparent. Residents have not been afforded the opportunity to seek answers to highly relevant questions during these Budget Hearings.

Today, I call on Council Member Rivas, Mayor Victor Gordo, and all elected officials to provide answers to these pertinent questions **now**, BEFORE Voting on the Budget.

If Staff cannot answer the questions or if the answers provided are *not* in line with good stewardship over our community's funds, I request that you Reject the proposed budget. Until good stewardship over our City Budget funds can be proven, this budget must be rejected.

Sincerely,
Margaret Starbuck

06/21/2021
Item 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: Eloise Kaeck
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 2:45 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: thank you

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...](#)

Thanks to City Council for adding money for homeless shelters and the loan to Heritage Housing. We appreciate your good work in this area.

eloise kaeck

06/21/2021
Item 11

Jomsky, Mark

From:
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 2:35 PM
To: Novelo, Lilia; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Comment on City Council Agenda Item #11 - June 21, 2021

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...](#)

Lila and/Mark-

I apologize if sending you this email is an manner in which to comment on tonight’s agenda. I promise to learn the process and send future emails in the proper form. See forward the below comment on item #11 to the City Council members.

Michelle White

City Council Members-

City staff has not recommended setting aside funding to assist low wage workers, who, because of the loss of their jobs, are at risk of eviction and permanent displacement out of Pasadena starting July 1. The units presently occupied by low income tenants – because of vacancy decontrol of rents – will thereafter be occupied by higher income tenants and Northwest and other lower income communities will be gentrified and existing households of color will be displaced.

According to the Eviction Defense Network, 500,000 households in Los Angeles County are presently behind on their rent because of COVID and are subject to eviction beginning July 1, 2021. The American Census Survey estimates that tenants constitute 62% of Pasadena’s residents. At present, neither Housing nor Planning Departments know how many Pasadena tenants are behind in their rent and are therefore at risk of eviction. Once low wage tenants fall behind in their rent, it is virtually impossible to catch up. At this point, there is a moratorium on COVID related evictions. Tenants affected by COVID related loss of income need rent forgiveness, not a moratorium. The City should use the monies that it has/will receive to address COVID concerns to forgive the rent burdens that its tenants now owe through no fault of their own. The City should also fund legal services for tenants who will be facing eviction starting July 1.

Michelle White
Tenant, District #5

06/21/2021
Item 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: Esprit Jones <
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 3:27 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Agenda item #11

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...](#)

Good day Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

I am a resident in District 1 and I am absolutely concerned with the Council's lack of concern with the details of the expanding police budget and the disregard it shows community members of our city. I am asking that you stop disregarding the cries of the community and dig into our collective concerns before you all vote yes on this matter. Last week's meeting was a slap in the face. Increasing PPD's budget is NOT GOOD for building community relationships.

I have seen a great deal of disparity as result of Covid 19 and homicide of Anthony McClain by PPD officers. Either would be enough to cause a mental break alone... however, many residents of our city have been directly and indirectly effected by both. In the middle of a global pandemic, Officer Edwin Dumaguindin shot Anthony in the back and several other officers (names unknown) contributed to his demise by delaying medical attention, handcuffing and putting pressure on this body to cause more bleeding. This was witnessed by more than 10 community members and residents. The trauma this caused the direct witnesses has gone unaddressed by the Council, the city leadership, PPD... this is one example of service that our community could benefit from. As things are opening up, there are a great many concerns. Mental health services are a current necessity.

My 8 year old daughter has been traumatized by the terrors inflicted by PPD. Increasing their budget sends the message that it is okay for PPD to terrorize our community. IT IS NOT OKAY!!! Sadly, I feel that because this wasn't/isn't a direct experience for any of you, so it isn't your concern. PPD literally harasses and terrorizes residents of this city. Why are they being paid to harass and terrorize us? And aren't they already getting another \$5 million thru PUSD? Another way to traumatize and terrorize our children... this is disgusting!

Same as health care services. Various Councilmembers have pushed and pushed the urgency for the Covid 19 vaccine... pictures are seen all over town. Covid is not the only health matter. I know personally that community members who have lost jobs due to Covid 19, lost healthcare benefits and access to necessary medications. The push of people in our city who require medications to live are being disregarded.

I would like for these questions to be considered and answered before you collectively sign off on this outrageous increase for PPD.

- Why did PPD have a Revised total of **\$1,584,000 for "New Years Day General Fund Events,"** nearly as much as 2020 (actual costs), **even though there was no Rose Parade or Rose Bowl in FY 2021?**
- Why have the Pasadena Police Department's (PPD) **personnel costs (total) risen over \$6 million** from 2020 actual costs?
- Does the Council intend to **overfund PPD** in FY 2022, the way it did in FY2021, so that PPD can use reported "savings" on controversial projects?
 - (Note: PPD reportedly saved \$2.3 million from its FY2021 Operating Budget, and the Council recently approved some of these funds for PPD's new Mobile Command Center.)
 - Instead, why not **reduce PPD's budget by the \$2.3 million they did not need or use for its operations in FY 2021 to fund vital community projects** for FY 2022?
- Why has the City's portion for PPD **Retirement Benefits (SPERS) jumped** from \$10,915,288 (2020 actual) to \$15,755,242 (FY 2022), **despite the fact that there is no change in Full Time Equivalents** (also known as FTEs or work hours) **in PPD from 2020 to 2022?**

- Why did **Personnel category 805000 (Benefits)** rise by over a million dollars, from \$6,552,770 (2020 actual) to \$7,800,375 (FY 2022)?
- Why did **Services and Supplies category 815600 (Insurance)** more than triple from \$229,917 (2020 actual) to \$785,762 (FY 2022)?
- What **EXACTLY** is included in the *vague* category, “**Other Contract Services,**” which totals **\$3,055,641**?
- What **EXACTLY** is included in the *vague* category, “**Internal Service Charges,**” which totals **\$6,796,288** for “**strategic services,**” with **no further explanation.**
 - Compare this to the **Public Health Department’s** “Internal Service Charges” of \$1,095,811 (“health administration”) and the **Fire Department’s** “Internal Service Charges” of \$3,117,205 (“fire operations”).

We deserve **REAL CONSIDERATION** from the city's leadership. What has been done cannot be undone. Please PLEASE don't make this worse for us.

Regards,
Esprit Loren Jones
District 1 resident



RECEIVED

2021 JUN 21 PM 4:46

CITY OF PASADENA
CITY CLERK

To: Mayor Gordo and Members of the Pasadena City Council
From: Carl Selkin, member of the SJC Leadership Quartet
Subject: Proposed City Budget and Policing Reform
Date: June 21, 2021

I am writing to express dismay that the Police Department allocation in the proposed Pasadena City Budget preserves the status quo instead of investing in new approaches to public safety and policing

Our committee has met in the past with Chief Perez, Mayor Gordo and others to present constructive criticism of the approach to policing that has too often led to loss of life, over-reaction by police and the escalation of challenging situations into violent confrontations.

The status quo deprives Pasadenans of adequate protection, exposes us as resident taxpayers to exorbitant legal fees and expensive settlements without any sense of increased security and safety in the city.

We advocate for reforms within the police department to improve service and efficacy, but we are convinced that adopting models like Denver's STAR Plan and Oregon's CAHOOTS programs in Eugene and Portland can have an even greater impact in reducing crime and excessive use of armed officers that tend to create escalations from which all of us lose.

Experimental changes in high crime cities such as Camden, NJ, argue for bold steps in Pasadena to put us ahead of an upward swing in crime as tensions built up over the course of the pandemic.

06/21/2021

Item 11

Martinez, Ruben

From: Pat Reddy
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 3:50 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Agenda Item 11

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 City Council Members,

Just a brief note to express support for full funding of our Police, Fire and EMT services in the City's 2022 budget. Reasonable people can disagree over the role and scope of government, but one function that citizens can't readily provide for themselves is protection from crime, fire and access to emergency medical services. We now have a Community Police Oversight Commission "to enhance, develop, and strengthen community-police relations, and review and make recommendations regarding the ongoing operations of the police department to the chief of police, city manager, and/or city council." The establishment of the Commission goes a long way to allay any concerns about policing practices and give the community a direct voice in such matters.

Support for our homeless population is compassionate and necessary, but we don't have sufficient resources to go it alone. I know Pasadena participates in the LA County Homeless Initiative Policy Summits to develop coordinated plans for addressing the homeless challenge. LA County has substantial resources: with the passage by voters of the landmark Measure H sales tax – LA County is raising about \$355 million annually for ten years. *Is Pasadena eligible to tap into that funding? If not, is there anything we can do about it?*

Here are a few common sense suggestions:

- Homeless programs must be sustainable and included in Pasadena's base budget at whatever level we can afford after fully providing for our first responders.
- According to the Los Angeles Mission, 3 of 5 people are chronically homeless and struggle with a disabling condition (i.e., mental illness and substance abuse). So it's not enough to provide shelter – it has to be paired with programs to address mental health and addiction. Venice Beach is considering closing homeless encampments and offering shelter but requiring recipients to participate in recovery programs.
- Just last month, Gov. Gavin Newsom proposed \$12 billion in new funding to get more people experiencing homelessness in the state into housing within five years. The allocated funds are part of California's \$100 billion comeback plan, which still needs state legislative approval. Should the Plan pass, it would provide much needed funds to cities like Pasadena.
- Pasadena residents pay substantial Property Taxes to LA County and we should receive our "fair share" of the benefits associated with those taxes, including the \$1.2 billion of LA County bonds issued to address homelessness.

06/21/2021
Item 11

You have a difficult task in developing our annual budget and making allocations to the many and varied needs of our residents. Thanks for all you do in performing a thankless task.

Sincerely,
Pat Reddy

B.R.E. A.T.I.E. JUSTICE 365

RECEIVED
2021 JUN 21 PM 4:46

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

June 21, 2021

RE: AGENDA ITEM #11: CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2022 OPERATING BUDGET

Dear Mayor and Pasadena City Council Members,

Our organization consists of Pasadenans residing throughout the various City Council Districts. Council Members, you represent our community as a whole.

Residents have not been afforded the opportunity to seek answers to highly relevant questions during FY 2022 Recommended Operating Budget Hearings.

We are asking you to answer, or direct Staff to **answer, the following important questions** during the discussion of Agenda Item #11, **before voting** to approve the Recommended City Budget:

1. Why did PPD have a Revised total of **\$1,584,000** for “New Years Day General Fund Events,” nearly as much as 2020 (actual costs), even though **there was no Rose Parade or Rose Bowl** in FY 2021?
2. Why have the Pasadena Police Department’s (PPD) **personnel costs (total) risen over \$6 million** from 2020 actual costs?
3. Does the Council intend to **overfund PPD** in FY 2022, the way it did in FY 2021, so that PPD can use reported savings on controversial capital improvement projects?
 - Instead, why not **reduce PPD’s budget by the \$2.3 million they did not need or use for its operations in FY 2021 to fund vital community projects** for FY 2022?
4. Why has the City’s portion for PPD **Retirement Benefits (SPERS)** jumped from \$10,915,288 (2020 actual) to \$15,755,242 (FY 2022), **despite the fact that there is no change in Full Time Equivalent** (also known as FTEs or work hours) in PPD from 2020 to 2022?
5. Why did **Personnel category 805000 (Benefits) rise by over a million dollars**, from \$6,552,770 (2020 actual) to \$7,800,375 (FY 2022)?
6. Why did **Services and Supplies category 815600 (Insurance) more than triple** from \$229,917 (2020 actual) to \$785,762 (FY 2022)?
7. What **exactly** is included in the **vague category, “Other Contract Services,”** which totals **\$3,055,641**?

06/21/2021
Item 11

8. What **exactly** is included in the **vague category, “Internal Service Charges,”** which totals **\$6,796,288** for **“strategic services,”** with **no further explanation.**

- Why does this so drastically differ from the **Public Health Department’s** “Internal Service Charges” of \$1,095,811 (“health administration”) and the **Fire Department’s** “Internal Service Charges” of \$3,117,205 (“fire operations”).

Many Council Members promised **transparency** while campaigning. Voting on the budget without answering pertinent questions is *not* transparent. Please address your constituents’ questions and concerns.

Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) negotiated without community transparency are *not* valid excuses for extraordinarily high PPD personnel costs funded by Pasadena residents.

Today, we call on you, Mayor Gordo, Vice Mayor Wilson, and Council Members Hampton, Williams, Kennedy, Masuda, Rivas and Madison to **provide answers to these pertinent questions *before* voting on the Budget.**

If Staff cannot answer the questions or if the answers provided are *not* in line with good stewardship over our community’s funds, we request that you Reject the proposed budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

The B.R.E.A.T.H.E. Justice 365 Team

A Pasadena-based collective of physicians, attorneys, executives, educators, clergy, activists, parents and everyday citizens united for equity in policing.

Martinez, Ruben

From: Marjani Forte <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 5:00 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Demanding an Equitable Transparent 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...](#)

Greetings,

My name is Marjani Saunders. I live in District 1, Tyron Hampton, you are my Council Member, and Mr. Gordo, you are my Mayor. City Council Members, you represent our community as a whole. I am asking you to direct City Staff to answer the following important questions during the discussion of Agenda Item #11, **BEFORE VOTING** to approve the Recommended City Budget:

- 1) Does the Council intend to **overfund PPD** in FY 2022, the way it did in FY2021, so that PPD can use reported "savings" on controversial projects?
 - (Note: PPD reportedly saved \$2.3 million from its FY2021 Operating Budget, and the Council recently approved some of these funds for PPD's new Mobile Command Center.)
 - Instead, why not **reduce PPD's budget by the \$2.3 million they did not need or use for its operations in FY 2021 to fund vital community projects for FY 2022**
 - 2) Why has the City's portion for **PPD Retirement Benefits (SPERS) jumped** from \$10,915,288 (2020 actual) to \$15,755,242 (FY 2022), **despite the fact that there is no change in Full Time Equivalent** (also known as FTEs or work hours) **in PPD from 2020 to 2022?**
 - 3) Why did **Personnel category 805000 (Benefits) rise by over a million dollars**, from \$6,552,770 (2020 actual) to \$7,800,375 (FY 2022)?
 - Why did **Services and Supplies category 815600 (Insurance) more than triple** from \$229,917 (2020 actual) to \$785,762 (FY 2022)?
 - What **EXACTLY** is included in the **vague category, "Other Contract Services,"** which totals **\$3,055,641?**

Many Council Members promised **Transparency while** campaigning. Voting on the budget without answering pertinent questions is **not** transparent. Residents have not been afforded the opportunity to seek answers to highly relevant questions during these Budget Hearings.

Today, I call on Council Member Tyron Hampton Mayor Victor Gordo, and all elected officials to provide answers to these pertinent questions **now**, **BEFORE** Voting on the Budget.

If Staff cannot answer the questions or if the answers provided are *not* in line with good stewardship over our community's funds, I request that you Reject the proposed budget. Until good stewardship over our City Budget funds can be proven, this budget must be rejected.

Sincerely,

Marjani Saunders

--

Writing on the go- please forgive typos!

Marjani Forté-Saunders|7NMS

@marjaniforte_works

@7nms_