

Martinez, Ruben

From: Loretta Mockler <loretta.mockler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 2:53 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Against waiving campaign contribution limits

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...](#)

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal to waive campaign contributions limits.

I concur with Jon Furman's written remarks below and urge the Council to reject this proposal.

Loretta Mockler

Pasadena, CA

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jon Fuhrman
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 11:28 AM
To: correspondence@cityofpasadena.net
Subject: Campaign Contribution Limits

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

I was distressed to see that the City Council is moving to waive all limits on contributions to City Council candidates. I think that's a bad idea in and of itself. Worse, though, I think it directly violates the spirit and intent of the state law.

I know that technically the law states cities can establish other limits, and I understand the City Attorney's argument that no limit qualifies as an other limit. But if you look at the "Findings" adopted by the Legislature as a preface to AB 571, you can see that is not at all what they anticipated.

SECTION 1.

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

- (a) Most states impose limitations on contributions to candidates for elective county and city offices. California is among the minority of states without these contribution limitations.
- (b) Most counties and cities in this state have not independently imposed limitations on contributions to candidates for elective offices in those jurisdictions.
- (c) In counties and cities in this state that have not imposed limitations on contributions, candidates for elective offices in those jurisdictions often receive contributions that would exceed the limitations for a state Senate campaign, even though most counties and cities contain far fewer people than the average state Senate district.
- (d) In counties and cities in this state that have not imposed limitations on contributions, candidates for elective office in those jurisdictions sometimes raise 40 percent or more of their total campaign funds from a single contributor.
- (e) A system allowing unlimited contributions to a candidate for elective county or city office creates the risk and the perception that elected officials in those jurisdictions are beholden to their contributors and will act in the best interest of those contributors at the expense of the people.
- (f) This state has a statewide interest in preventing actual corruption and the appearance of corruption at all levels of government.
- (g) This act establishes a limitation on contributions to a candidate for elective office in a city or county in which the local government has not established a limitation. However, a local government may establish a different limitation that is more precisely tailored to the needs of its communities.

The whole thrust of the Findings is to eliminate the possibility of unlimited contributions, while allowing cities to establish a "different limitation that is more precisely tailored to the needs to the community". That was clearly intended to allow cities (like LA) and counties (like LA and Ventura) to keep the lower limits they already impose. It is manifestly not intended to allow communities to dodge the law and say the sky's the limit. Findings (d), (e) and (f) clearly point to the dangers that the lack of any limits introduce into local politics and assert that the state has a statewide interest in preventing "actual corruption and the appearance of corruption" at all levels of government. Surely that is something we can all agree upon, and surely placing modest limits on campaign contributions will not be overly burdensome on our local candidates.

Please note that this does not prevent a candidate from self-funding their campaign, to whatever level he or she feels appropriate. A candidate's contributions to their own campaign are exempt

from campaign contributions limits.

Further, most candidates, both incumbents and challengers, have formally or informally chosen not to accept contributions in excess of \$5,000, so adhering to this limit would have had virtually no impact on recent campaigns. Further, the limit is per election, so if a candidate is forced into a run-off, the candidate can accept \$4,900 contributions from the same person for the primary and then again for the run-off election. Additionally, the limits are per person, so two spouses can each give the maximum amount, and can do so for each election. Thus, a couple could contribute nearly \$20,000 to a candidate who ran in both a primary and a run-off election.

Lastly, the contribution limit is doubled for small contributor committees -- committees that raise funds in small dollar contributions from a large membership base (like the political action funds of a teachers' union or a firefighters' union), and again the contribution limit applies separately to a primary and run-off election.

I hope, upon reflection, you will reconsider your support of the proposal. Having a \$4,900 limit (indexed to inflation) seems quite reasonable and sufficient. There is no reason to harp upon "local rule" and insist that we go our own way.

Jon Fuhrman

, Pasadena, CA 91105-2749

Martinez, Ruben

From: Sue Cook <
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 3:14 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Campaign Contribution Limits

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...](#)

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

I was distressed to see that the City Council is moving to waive all limits on contributions to City Council candidates. I think that's a bad idea in and of itself. Worse, though, I think it directly violates the spirit and intent of the state law.

I know that technically the law states cities can establish other limits, and I understand the City Attorney's argument that no limit qualifies as an other limit. But if you look at the "Findings" adopted by the Legislature as a preface to AB 571, you can see that is not at all what they anticipated.

SECTION 1.

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Most states impose limitations on contributions to candidates for elective county and city offices. California is among the minority of states without these contribution limitations.

(b) Most counties and cities in this state have not independently imposed limitations on contributions to candidates for elective offices in those jurisdictions.

(c) In counties and cities in this state that have not imposed limitations on contributions, candidates for elective offices in those jurisdictions often receive contributions that would exceed the limitations for a state Senate campaign, even though most counties and cities contain far fewer people than the average state Senate district.

(d) In counties and cities in this state that have not imposed limitations on contributions, candidates for elective office in those jurisdictions sometimes raise

40 percent or more of their total campaign funds from a single contributor.

(e) A system allowing unlimited contributions to a candidate for elective county or city office creates the risk and the perception that elected officials in those jurisdictions are beholden to their contributors and will act in the best interest of those contributors at the expense of the people.

(f) This state has a statewide interest in preventing actual corruption and the appearance of corruption at all levels of government.

(g) This act establishes a limitation on contributions to a candidate for elective office in a city or county in which the local government has not established a limitation. However, a local government may establish a different limitation that is more precisely tailored to the needs of its communities.

The whole thrust of the Findings is to eliminate the possibility of unlimited contributions, while allowing cities to establish a "different limitation that is more precisely tailored to the needs to the community". That was clearly intended to allow cities (like LA) and counties (like LA and Ventura) to keep the lower limits they already impose. It is manifestly not intended to allow communities to dodge the law and say the sky's the limit. Findings (d), (e) and (f) clearly point to the dangers that the lack of any limits introduce into local politics and assert that the state has a statewide interest in preventing "actual corruption and the appearance of corruption" at all levels of government. Surely that is something we can all agree upon, and surely placing modest limits on campaign contributions will not be overly burdensome on our local candidates.

Please note that this does not prevent a candidate from self-funding their campaign, to whatever level he or she feels appropriate. A candidate's contributions to their own campaign are exempt from campaign contributions limits.

Further, most candidates, both incumbents and challengers, have formally or informally chosen not to accept contributions in excess of \$5,000, so adhering to this limit would have had virtually no impact on recent campaigns. Further, the limit is per election, so if a candidate is forced into a run-off, the candidate can accept \$4,900 contributions from the same person for the primary and then again for the run-off election. Additionally, the limits are per person, so two spouses can each give the maximum amount, and can do so for each election. Thus, a couple could contribute nearly \$20,000 to a candidate who ran in both a primary and a run-off election.

Lastly, the contribution limit is doubled for small contributor committees --

committees that raise funds in small dollar contributions from a large membership base (like the political action funds of a teachers' union or a firefighters' union), and again the contribution limit applies separately to a primary and run-off election.

I hope, upon reflection, you will reconsider your support of the proposal. Having a \$4,900 limit (indexed to inflation) seems quite reasonable and sufficient. There is no reason to harp upon "local rule" and insist that we go our own way.

Warmly,

Sue Cook
Realtor • CB Realty
suecookrealtor@gmail.com
626.253.1323

**Open Letter to Pasadena Mayor Victor Gordo and City Councilmembers
to lead Pasadena's Fight for a Truly Inclusive Government
by Implementing Urgently Needed Campaign Finance Reform**

RECEIVED
OCT 18 PM 0
CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

We, the undersigned local community leaders, advocates, and residents respectfully urge Pasadena Mayor Victor Gordo and Pasadena's Councilmembers to pass **crucially** needed campaign finance reform to fulfill Mayor Gordo's promise of ensuring Pasadena's "local city government is responsive...and accountable to residents," and exemplifies "a Pasadena that truly listens, is inclusive of everyone, [and] stands with our families, our seniors, and our youth."

Specifically, we call on Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers to:

- (i) **RESCIND** the Council's August 16 vote instructing the preparation of an ordinance codifying into law unlimited campaign contributions from donors to city candidates (exploiting a loophole in state law that allows local jurisdictions to circumvent the default state donor limit, which is currently \$4,900 per contributor to city candidates); and
- (ii) **PLACE** reasonable per-contributor limits on direct funding of local campaigns, in keeping with sensible surrounding cities like Los Angeles, Alhambra, and South Pasadena, as well as dozens of local jurisdictions across Southern California. (For example, Los Angeles with a population of almost 4 million has a \$800 limit as of 2020, in contrast to Pasadena with a population of about 140,000.)

Our request is based on the following:

- The City of Pasadena is one of the two most unequal cities in California, with an ever widening economic divide. Moneyed interests have far too much sway in Pasadena politics, which we believe has led to questionable city policies and unequal representation.
- We are in agreement with the Campaign Legal Center which states:
"The First Amendment guarantees every American the right to participate fully in the political process. It is well-known that the dependence of political candidates on wealthy special interests is a serious flaw in our political system, and makes elected officials responsive to their large donors rather than to the public. The tremendous power of special interest money in politics often drowns out the voice of everyday Americans, threatens our First Amendment freedoms, and erodes the foundations of our entire democracy."
The Center also said that to restore fairness to our political system, the passing and enforcing of strong campaign finance reforms that help guarantee a democracy responsive to the people is urgently needed, including placing reasonable limits on funding of campaigns, complete transparency of campaign spending, and public financing of elections. (Campaign Legal Center 2020; Brennan Center 2018; Public Citizen 2020; Common Cause 2016)
- **It is unreasonable and ethically suspect that any city should have contribution limits higher than that imposed upon state candidates.** The California Legislature adopted state ethics law AB 571 effective January 1, 2021 imposing state contribution limits for state elections as default limits for county and city elections, with the ability for local jurisdictions to establish different limits. The default state limit this year is \$4,900 per contributor to city candidates.
- When given the chance to participate democratically in setting campaign finance limits, citizens are clear that they want limits, and understand the danger of the undue influence of wealthy donors. After a citywide referendum, sister city Alhambra voted overwhelmingly (*by over 76%*) last year to adopt comprehensive campaign finance reform with an inflation-adjusted local campaign contribution limit of \$250 for candidates running in by-district elections. There are other California cities with similar or lower donor limits, which is often based on a municipality's size and electoral format.
- **We are alarmed that Pasadena voted on August 16 to place no dollar limits on local campaign contributions,** with a first reading of the ordinance to be conducted October 18 (and codification effective after two readings).
- **Pasadena City Council is unjustified in claiming contribution limits for state candidates are too low for Pasadena Mayoral and City Council candidates.** Rather, stricter limits would (i) provide incentives to candidates to build a broader base of smaller contributors to be viable; (ii) empower smaller donors as well as expand the pool of potential candidates to include those with no ties to big money thus enabling wider representation among the populace; and (iii) induce greater candidate-constituent interaction and messaging, as opposed to the current practice of blanketing a district with cookie-cutter political mailers.

It's time now for Mayor Victor Gordo and Pasadena Councilmembers to lead the fight for a truly inclusive local city government. We urge you, Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers, to stand with our families and communities in urgently drafting and voting on a municipal ordinance to place reasonable limits per contributor on funding of local campaigns in Pasadena, following the lead of dozens of other Southern California cities. ***Doing so would engender trust in Pasadena city leaders and candidates and help create a City that is truly more inclusive of everyone.***

Signed: (by city, in alphabetical order; affiliations noted for identification purposes only)

Residents of Pasadena (101)

Stephen Akuginow, Pasadena resident
Maureen Allen, Pasadena resident
Pat Amsbry, Pasadena resident; Board of Directors & Chair Emeritus, Rose Bowl Aquatics Center
Cheryl Auger, Pasadena resident; President, Ban SUP/Ban SUP Refill
Helen Bacon, Pasadena resident
Edda Suzanne Barber, Pasadena resident
Diane Becera, Pasadena resident
James Beck, Pasadena resident
Ryan Bell, Pasadena resident; 2020 Pasadena City Council candidate; City Commissioner, Pasadena Northwest Commission; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Sonja Berndt, Pasadena resident
Maryanne Berry, Pasadena resident
Robert Bilheimer, Pasadena resident
Austin Blodgett, Pasadena resident
Simon Bluestone, Pasadena resident
Colin Bogard, Pasadena resident, Pasadena Complete Streets Coalition
Katherine Breeden, Pasadena resident
Claire Spiegel Brian, Pasadena resident
Tim Brick, Pasadena resident
Robert Bruce, Pasadena resident
Tasha Busch-Arratia, Pasadena resident
Allen Cappuccilli, Pasadena resident
Margaret Cameron, Pasadena resident; Member, West Pasadena Residents Association
Angel Castillo, Pasadena resident; Member, DSA-LA & Pasadena Tenants Union
Mary Cifuentes, Pasadena resident
Jennifer Collins, LCSW, Pasadena resident; PUSD parent and Licensed Clinical Social Worker
Ramona Coronado Pasadena resident
Areta Crowell, Pasadena resident
William Denman, Pasadena resident
Julie DiazMartinez, Pasadena resident
Thomas Dickey, Pasadena resident
William Dickson, Pasadena resident
William Dowell, Pasadena resident; Member, Pasadena Tenants' Union
John Doyle, Pasadena resident; PUSD Parent and 2024 Pasadena City Council candidate, District 4; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Kimberly Drake, Ph.D., Pasadena resident; Member, Neighbors of North Raymond
Christine Echeverri, Pasadena resident
David Erickson, Pasadena resident;
Ellen Finkelpearl, Ph.D., Pasadena resident; Classics Professor; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Tina Fredericks, Pasadena resident; PUSD parent; CA Democratic Party Executive Board/delegate, AD 41
Betty Garcia, Pasadena resident
Andrew Good, Pasadena resident; Volunteer, Pasadena For All
Sandra B. Greenstein, Pasadena resident
Andrea Davis Griffin, Ph.D., Pasadena resident; Owner, Greenhouse Therapy
Emily Gross, Pasadena resident
Erin Gunn, Pasadena resident
Allison Henry, Pasadena resident; San Gabriel Valley Tenants Alliance, Housing Element Task Force member
Claire Hoffman, Pasadena resident; PUSD teacher
Dan Huynh, Pasadena resident
Charles Jacobsen, Pasadena resident; Member, Throop Unitarian Universalist Church
Geoffrey Jost, MLIS, Pasadena resident; Software Developer
Una Lee Jost, Esq., Pasadena resident; PUSD parent and Attorney; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41 (2019-2021)
Laurie Kietzman-Greer, Pasadena resident
Kai Kuwata, Pasadena resident
Wendy Kuwata, Pasadena resident
Bin Lee, Pasadena resident
Claudi Llanos, Pasadena resident
Joanne Long, Pasadena resident; Pasadena For All
Kathleen Mann, Pasadena resident

Anthony Manousos, Pasadena resident; Make Housing and Community Happen Co-Founder
Joshua Marmol, Pasadena resident; PUSD parent; CA Democratic Party delegate alternate, AD 41
Aaron Markowitz, Pasadena resident; Member, Pasadena Tenants Union
Liberty McCoy, Pasadena resident; Member, Pasadena Tenants Union
Christy Moision, Pasadena resident; PUSD Parent; Pasadena Complete Streets Coalition
Sam Morrissey, Pasadena resident
Bradley Moore, Pasadena resident
Lambda Moses, Pasadena resident
Kyle Murphy, Pasadena resident
Kaveh Naeeni, Pasadena resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Robert Nelson, Ph.D., Pasadena resident; JPL senior research scientist (ret.); Planetary Science Institute senior scientist; CA Democratic Party Executive Board member (2019-2021) and delegate, AD 41
Bert Newton, Pasadena resident
Gloria Newton, Pasadena resident
Okorie Okorochoa, Pasadena resident
Jane Panangaden, Pasadena resident; Member, Pasadena Tenants Union
Teresa Parsekian, Pasadena resident
Brooke Peterson, Pasadena resident
Mindy Pfeiffer, Pasadena resident; Co-President, Washington Square Neighborhood Association
Chris Peck, Pasadena resident; President, CM Peck Inc.
Peggy Renner, Ph.D., Pasadena resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Wesley Reutimann, Pasadena resident; Co-organizer, Pasadena Environmental Advocates (PEAs)
Brian Ridley, Pasadena resident
Denise Robb, Ph.D., Pasadena resident; PUSD parent and Political Science Professor
Virginia Robbins, Pasadena resident; Democrat
Brigitte Rooney, Pasadena resident; Member, Pasadena Tenants Union
Adam Rosenkranz, Pasadena resident
Jessica Rusk, Pasadena resident
Caryn Sakuda, Pasadena resident
David Sniezko, Pasadena resident
Frank Scoffield, Pasadena resident; Gang Preventionist; Member, Pasadena Mennonite Church; Graduate, Fuller Theological Seminary
Candace Seu, Pasadena resident
Donna Sider, Pasadena resident
Alan Siems, Pasadena resident
Bonnie Skolnik, Pasadena resident;
John Smallenburg, Pasadena resident, Member, United Teachers of Pasadena
Marcy Springer, Pasadena resident
Amanda Steiman, Pasadena resident
Victor Suarez, Pasadena resident
Julie Tannenbaum, Pasadena resident
Mitchell Tsai, Esq., Pasadena resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Richard Valencia, Pasadena resident
Andi Wammack, Pasadena resident; PUSD parent
Beau Wammack, Pasadena resident; PUSD parent
Hesham Zaini, Pasadena resident

Friends of Pasadena (40)

Sam Berndt, Altadena resident, JPL engineer, Sunrise Movement Los Angeles Co-Founder, CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Victoria Carbé-Chen, Altadena resident
Steven Gibson, Ph.D., Altadena resident; Scholar/Author, Vice President of Campaigns, Democrats of Pasadena Foothills; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Charlotte Gibson, Altadena resident; Member, Democrats of Pasadena Foothills
Todd Jones, Altadena resident, JPL scientist; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party elected member, AD 41
Julie McKune, Altadena resident; Member, League of Women Voters & POP!; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41 (2019-2021)
Jamie Perlman, Altadena resident
Anne Tipton, Altadena resident
Katie Chan, Alhambra resident; CA Democratic Party Progressive Caucus Secretary; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 49
Gerry Fagoaga, M.F.T., Alhambra resident; Marriage and Family Therapist (ret.); Grassroots Alhambra Co-Founder
Melissa Michelson, Alhambra resident; President, Feel the Bern Democratic Club, Los Angeles; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party elected member, AD49
Efren Moreno, Jr., Alhambra resident; Member, Grassroots Alhambra
Lili Munoz, Alhambra resident

Chris Olson, Alhambra resident; Board member, Grassroots Alhambra
Tatiana Becker, Arcadia resident
Leslie Chang, Arcadia resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 49
Andrea Garcia-Ponce De Leon, Azusa resident; Executive Director, Project Amiga
Denis Recendez, Azusa resident; Member, Democrats of Pasadena Foothills, DSA-LA, and San Gabriel Valley Progressives; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party elected member, AD48
Michael Boos, Claremont resident; Executive Board & Corresponding Secretary, Democratic Club of Claremont; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41 (2019-21)
Susan Castagnetto, Claremont resident, Consumer Advocate; CA Democratic Party alternate delegate, AD 41
Pamela Nagler, Claremont resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41 (2019-21)
Jack Weidner, Claremont resident
Gabriel Ramirez, El Monte resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 49; LA County Democratic Party alternate member, AD49; Member, Feel The Bern Democratic Club Los Angeles
Sean Broadbent, Glendale resident; Co-Chair, DSA-LA Healthcare Justice Committee; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 43
Mike Van Gorder, Glendale resident
Ryan Thompson, Glendora resident
Michael Daurio, Los Angeles resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 53
Lex F., Los Angeles resident
Kate Grodd, Los Angeles resident
Jeanine Rohn, Los Angeles resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party delegate, AD 51
Sara D. Roos, Los Angeles resident; Biostatistician/Education Writer; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party elected member, AD 54
Patricia Hernandez, Monrovia resident; Member, DSA-LA
David Ly, Rosemead resident
Lorena Gutierrez, San Gabriel resident
Paul Cole Padilla, San Gabriel resident; CA Democratic Party delegate, LACCC; LA County Democratic Party elected member, AD49
Sean McMorris, San Gabriel resident; President, Represent.Us San Gabriel Valley-Los Angeles Chapter; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 49
Keith Berman, MPH, MBA, Sierra Madre resident
Gabriel Chen, Sierra Madre resident
Cindy Montoya, Sierra Madre resident; CA State Survivor Lead, Moms Demand Action; CA Democratic Party delegate, AD 41
Mona Talamantes, South Pasadena resident

Groups (4)

Ban SUP
Progressive Asian Network for Action
Represent.US, Los Angeles-San Gabriel Valley Chapter
San Gabriel Valley Progressive Alliance
Urban Ecology Project

Martinez, Ruben

From: Una Lee Jost
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 4:29 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: 2021-10-18 Pasadena City Council Meeting - Public Comment - Agenda Item #15

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...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena Mayor Gordo and City Councilmembers:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on Agenda Item #15.

I am writing in support of the
"Open Letter to Pasadena Mayor Victor Gordo and City Councilmembers to lead Pasadena's Fight for a Truly Inclusive Government by Implementing Urgently Needed Campaign Finance Reform."

Written in strong opposition to the proposed ordinance to codify NO limits on campaign contributions, the Open Letter was signed by a growing coalition of:

- over 100 Pasadena residents;
- concerned residents from over a dozen nearby cities; and
- several groups.

The Open Letter outlines in detail why the community is calling on each of you to:

- (i) RESCIND the Council's August 16 vote instructing the preparation of an ordinance codifying into law unlimited campaign contributions from donors to city candidates (exploiting a loophole in state law that allows local jurisdictions to circumvent the default state donor limit, which is currently \$4,900 per contributor to city candidates); and
- (ii) PLACE reasonable per-contributor limits on direct funding of local campaigns, in keeping with sensible surrounding cities like Los Angeles, Alhambra, and South Pasadena, as well as dozens of local jurisdictions across Southern California. (For example, Los Angeles with a population of almost 4 million has a \$800 limit as of 2020, in contrast to Pasadena with a population of about 140,000.)

The Open Letter highlights, among other items, the importance of the First Amendment of the US Bill of Rights which guarantees every American the right to participate fully in the political process. Likewise, the California Constitution contains individual rights clauses, construed as protecting rights even broader than the US Bill of Rights.

Local city governments such as Pasadena are not immune to the tremendous power of special interest money in politics that often drowns out the voice of everyday Pasadenans, threatening our right to participate fully in the political process, and eroding the foundations of our entire democracy. In fact, the City of Pasadena is one of the two most unequal cities in California, with unequal representation leading to an ever widening economic divide.

Nonprofit public interest government reform organizations working to strengthen democracy, such as Campaign Legal Center, Brennan Center, Public Citizen, Common Cause, and California Clean Money Campaign, are all in consensus that in order to restore fairness to our political system, the passing and enforcing of strong campaign finance reforms is urgently needed to help guarantee a democracy responsive to the people,

including:

- placing reasonable limits on funding of campaigns;
- complete transparency of campaign spending, and
- public financing of elections.

I join my voice with fellow Pasadenans and allies in urging Mayor Gordo and Pasadena Councilmembers to lead the fight for a truly inclusive local city government. We urge you, Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers, to stand with our families and communities in urgently drafting and voting on a municipal ordinance to place reasonable limits per contributor on funding of local campaigns in Pasadena, following the lead of dozens of other Southern California cities. Doing so would engender trust in Pasadena city leaders and candidates and help create a City that is truly more inclusive of everyone.

In hope for the welfare of our City and Nation, ~ Una Lee Jost, Resident of Pasadena, District 4

Martinez, Ruben

From: Jill Shook <Jill@makinghousinghappen.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 4:50 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Hampton, Tyron; Kennedy, John J.
Subject: re: correspondence from Jill Shook for #s 13, 14 and 15

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...](#)

#13

I'm so grateful that the city has put the ban on the sale of leaf blowers on the agenda. But I have to admit, I wish it was about banning leaf blowers, not just stopping their sale. Not only are they noise polluters, which can cause severe hearing loss and making it difficult for so many of us who now work out of our homes, but some studies say that the kind of two stroke engines the use emit nearly 300 times the amount of air pollutants as a pickup truck. That is astounding.

Our gardener is not happy about the idea of using electric blowers, but I care about his health as well as ours. We must value life over profit. And we must do all we can do address climate change. When I was on the City Hall side walk last week, a leaf blower pushed dust and leaves into my path. When he realized it, he felt badly and apologized. It was surprising to see that the city hired someone with the kind of gas engine we hope to ban to sale of today. But then I thought about our gardeners gas blower and how we too are not yet banning it in our yard. If gas blowers were completely banned as they are in Beverly Hills, then it would be much easier for us require alternatives. We'd be glad to offer some extra money for the time it takes for our gardener to rake and we make sure he uses our more quite electric blower but he is reluctant as it slows him down. We need to stop and think about our values, Is efficient and profit more important than saving our planet and being a good neighbor? Wed like all our neighbors to do likewise. Please direct the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance to amend Title 9 (Public Peace, Morals and Welfare) of the Pasadena Municipal Code to prohibit the use of gas-powered leaf blowing machines within Pasadena.

14

I appreciate the staff's thorough report on the housing crisis. They describe Pasadena's efforts to address it as well as the state's new policies to help us make more affordable housing happen. According to the Turner's Centers, a projected 2,000 folks in Pasadena could take advantage of SB 9. This would help us not only to address our growing housing Crisis but also reach our RHNA goals and create safety.

I would welcome subdivided lots and duplexes in my neighborhood. Despite there being a number of ADUs on our block, we have no parking issues and in fact it feels very quiet with little to no foot traffic. With more folks walking in neighborhood, there are more eyes on the street and more safety. Neighbors like our friend Joyce walk our neighborhood every day and know what is happening. I feel so grateful for her and am excited about SB 9.

I invite you to join us on Oct. 26th at 7pm to learn more about this policy and several other new state policies. See: <https://makinghousinghappen.net/2021/10/12/mhch-housing-justice-forum-october-2021/>

#15:

I love our democracy. It's amazing that this experiment has worked for as long as it has, but one of the reasons that it is that we all vote, all people, even those little means. One thing that is destroying our precious democracy is money in politics. Money cannot and should not be the measure for how we make decisions. I have to admit, it was shocking to me that putting no limit on contributions is even being considered. Please refuse this lie that is destroying our nation. As a person of faith, I seek to live my life by the Christian Scriptures. I love Matt 6:33—seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, in the Spanish Bible it says to uses the word "Justicia" –justice. Seek what matters to God, to do justice, to love and seek mercy, equity, inclusion of all people no matter their income. And the promise that follows this verse is this—that all these things will be added unto you. If you have the courage do what is right, that is what will get you elected. Please do not allow no limit on campaign donations. Thank you!!

Jill Shook

Jill Shook, Missions Door, Catalyst

Doctor of Ministry, Bakke Graduate School

Blog: makinghousinghappen.net Websites: www.makinghousinghappen.org and makinghousinghappen.com

Author/Editor: *Making Housing Happen: Faith Based Affordable Housing Models*

Phone:



Martinez, Ruben

From: Tamara Silver < >
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 4:42 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Limit campaign spending? Yes!

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 Councilmembers,

Please do not approve the ordinance to allow limitless campaign contributions.

I am surprised and disappointed that you would pass such an ordinance. I cannot see that large contributions have resulted in better government for us at any level of government.

Please cap per person campaign contributions to our municipal elections.

Thank you,

Tamara Silver
Resident of District 7

10/18/2021
Item 15

Martinez, Ruben

From: Char Bland < >
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 5:15 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Char charbland2003@yahoo.com
Subject: City of Pasadena Campaign Limits

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 Gordo and Councilmembers:

As a past Candidate for City Council it is concerning to see that the City Council is moving to waive all limits on contributions to City Council candidates.

It's important in this political climate to have campaign equity and " no limit campaign contributions " doesn't offer an inclusive political landscape for prospective future candidates and violates the spirit and intent of the state law.

Technically the law states cities can establish other limits, and I understand the City Attorney's argument that no limit qualifies as an other limit. But if you look at the "Findings" adopted by the Legislature as a preface to AB 571, you can see that is not at all what they anticipated.

SECTION 1.

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

- (a) Most states impose limitations on contributions to candidates for elective county and city offices. California is among the minority of states without these contribution limitations.
- (b) Most counties and cities in this state have not independently imposed limitations on contributions to candidates for elective offices in those jurisdictions.
- (c) In counties and cities in this state that have not imposed limitations on contributions, candidates for elective offices in those jurisdictions often receive contributions that would exceed the limitations for a state Senate campaign, even though most counties and cities contain far fewer people than the average state Senate district.
- (d) In counties and cities in this state that have not imposed limitations on contributions, candidates for elective office in those jurisdictions sometimes raise 40 percent or more of their total campaign funds from a single contributor.
- (e) A system allowing unlimited contributions to a candidate for elective county or city office

creates the risk and the perception that elected officials in those jurisdictions are beholden to their contributors and will act in the best interest of those contributors at the expense of the people.

(f) This state has a statewide interest in preventing actual corruption and the appearance of corruption at all levels of government.

(g) This act establishes a limitation on contributions to a candidate for elective office in a city or county in which the local government has not established a limitation. However, a local government may establish a different limitation that is more precisely tailored to the needs of its communities.

The whole thrust of the Findings is to eliminate the possibility of unlimited contributions, while allowing cities to establish a "different limitation that is more precisely tailored to the needs to the community". That was clearly intended to allow cities (like LA) and counties (like LA and Ventura) to keep the lower limits they already impose. It is manifestly not intended to allow communities to dodge the law and say the sky's the limit. Findings (d), (e) and (f) clearly point to the dangers that the lack of any limits introduce into local politics and assert that the state has a statewide interest in preventing "actual corruption and the appearance of corruption" at all levels of government. Surely that is something we can all agree upon, and surely placing modest limits on campaign contributions will not be overly burdensome on our local candidates.

Please note that this does not prevent a candidate from self-funding their campaign, to whatever level he or she feels appropriate. A candidate's contributions to their own campaign are exempt from campaign contributions limits.

Most candidates, both incumbents and challengers, have formally or informally chosen not to accept contributions in excess of \$5,000, so adhering to this limit would have had virtually no impact on recent campaigns. Further, the limit is per election, so if a candidate is forced into a run-off, the candidate can accept \$4,900 contributions from the same person for the primary and then again for the run-off election. Additionally, the limits are per person, so two spouses can each give the maximum amount, and can do so for each election. Thus, a couple could contribute nearly \$20,000 to a candidate who ran in both a primary and a run-off election.

The contribution limit is doubled for small contributor committees -- committees that raise funds in small dollar contributions from a large membership base (like the political action funds of a teachers' union or a firefighters' union), and again the contribution limit applies separately to a primary and run-off election.

Americans overwhelmingly support limits on political campaign spending, and most think new laws could effectively reduce the role of money in politics and I'm asking reconsider your support of the proposal. Having a \$4,900 limit (indexed to inflation) seems quite reasonable and sufficient. There is no reason to harp upon "local rule" and insist that we go our own way.

Charlotte "Char" Bland
Executive and Community Leader
Every Connection is a new opportunity.

HAVE A GREAT DAY, SEE YOU AT THE TOP!

Martinez, Ruben

From: Vicki Walsh
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 5:28 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Opposition to Proposal to waive Campaign Contribution limits

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...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,

I learned today of a proposal to waive campaign contribution limits for city elections and wish to express my opposition to such a proposal.

Waiving these limits goes against the spirit of a fair election and would erode the integrity of the electoral process, with favor going to those, not of character, but of financial advantage.

Please reject this proposal.

Kind Regards, Vicki Tsang

10/18/2021
Item 15

Martinez, Ruben

From: George A. Brumder
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 5:44 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Marilyn Brumder
Subject: Campaign contribution limits

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...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers

This is to let you know that Marilyn and I strongly I agree with Jon Fuhrman's November 17 letter to you on this subject.

Thank you, George

George A. Brumder
Pasadena, CA 91105

Sent from my iPhone

10/18/2021
Item 15

Martinez, Ruben

From:
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 9:12 PM
To: Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Rivas, Jessica; Masuda, Gene; Williams, Felicia; Hampton, Tyron; Kennedy, John J.; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Study show that limiting campaign contributions don't hurt challengers

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,

I am strongly opposed to the idea of unlimited campaign contributions. I'd like to respond to the Mayor's claim that campaign contribution limits disadvantage those running against incumbents. I'd like to see what evidence he has for this assertion.

The National Voting Rights Institute (NVRI) and the State PIRGs Democracy Program released a study that found there is no support for the notion that campaign contribution limits hurt challengers. In fact, according to the study, contribution limits can work to reduce the financial bias that traditionally works in favor of incumbents.

<https://www.demos.org/press-release/statement-study-demonstrates-campaign-contribution-limits-do-not-harm-challengers>

As your constituents are telling you loud and clear, we need campaign finance reform here in Pasadena. I want to commend Councilmembers Rivas and Wilson for listening to the voice of the people.

People want money taken out of politics. According to the Pew Research Center, "77% of Americans say there should be limits on the amount of money individuals and groups can spend on campaigns."

I am shocked to hear that some City Council members feel that they can't be elected unless they receive unlimited funds from wealthy elites as well as from the Police association and Fire Department. In some contested City Council races, candidates have raised well over \$100,000, and \$250,000 in mayoral contests

I am especially concerned about how much Council members received from the police association during the last election: \$87,000.

On an individual basis, I urge each of you to agree not to accept contributions from the police association so you can be seen as fair and impartial.

I also urge you to lower the limit on campaign contributions to comply with state law or better yet, lower the limit to that of South Pasadena or Alhambra.

Anthony Manousos